Vol. III. DEC., 1865—JAN. & FEB., 1866. Nos. 8—10.

THE

THEOLOGICAL ECLECTIC.

MONTHLY.

A SERIES OF THEOLOGICAL PAPERS CHIEFLY SELECTED FROM THE PERIODICAL AND OTHER LITERATURE OF GREAT BRITAIN, FRANCE, GERMANY, AND HOLLAND.

EDITED BY

GEORGE E. DAY,

PROFESSOR IN LANE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

CONTENTS:

1. Dr. Pusey's Commentary on Jonah—(Concluded.)
2. Doedes on the Logical Result of the Naturalistic Philosophy. *Translated from the Dutch.*
3. Simeon on the Management of a Text and Sermon.
4. The Critical Labors of Dr. Tischendorf and his Discovery of the Sinai Bible. *Written by Himself.*
5. Tischendorf: When were our Gospels Composed? *Translated from the German.*

CINCINNATI:

WILLIAM SCOTT,

28 *WEST FOURTH STREET,*

1866.

Price, $1.50 a year. Postage, three cents a quarter if paid in advance.

Moore, Wilstach & Baldwin, Printers.

THE PRESENT NUMBER.

In consequence of the delay in issuing the December number of the Eclectic, it has been thought best to place it in the same cover with the January and February numbers, which are issued together for the sake of giving, at once, the larger part of Dr. Tischendorf's papers on the time when our Gospels were composed. A few pages in the March number will be sufficient to complete the article.

NEW BOOKS RECEIVED.

1. *Essays on the Supernatural Origin of Christianity, with Special Reference to the Theories of Renan, Strauss and the Tübingen School.* By Rev. George P. Fisher, M. A., Professor of Church History in Yale College. New York: Charles Scribner & Co.: 1866. For sale in Cincinnati, by Geo. S. Blanchard & Co. 8vo. pp. 586.

Under this modest title the author has given a calm, candid and forcible statement and refutation of the most recent critical objections to the genuineness and credibility of the New Testament, which entitles his work to a high place in the apologetical literature of the Church. In no work in English can such a thorough exposure of the weakness of the skeptical positions of Baur and the Tübingen school be found, and to none, can those who would be effectually fortified against one of the most dangerous forms of the new infidelity, be more confidently directed.

2 *History of Rationalism: embracing a Survey of the Present State of Protestant Theology.* By Rev. John F. Hurst, A. M. New York: Charles Scribner & Co.: 1865. 8vo. pp. 623. For sale in Cincinnati, by George S. Blanchard & Co.

The most comprehensive history of Rationalism extant; its tone is catholic and Evangelical, and its statements in general trustworthy. The author, a young minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, who has spent some time in Germany, clearly sees the issue about to be joined, and has rendered an important service in indicating the course of the more recent skepticism and the spirit in which it should be met. The work is a valuable contribution to our literature.

See third page of cover.

where Scripture saith *He repented*, it is said a little after, *He is not a man that He should repent.* When, then, He changes His works through His unchangeable counsel, He is said to repent, on account of the change, not of the counsel, but of the act."* S. Augustine thinks that God, by using this language of Himself, which all would feel to be inadequate to His majesty, meant, to teach us that all language is inadequate to His excellencies. "We say these things of God, because we do not find any thing better to say. I say, 'God is just,' because in man's words I find nothing better; for He is beyond justice. It is said in Scripture *God is just and loveth justice.* But in Scripture it is said that *God repenteth,* 'God is ignorant.' Who would not start back at this? Yet to that end Scripture condescendeth healthfully to those words from which thou shrinkest, that thou shouldest not think that what thou deemest great is said worthily of Him. If thou ask, what is said worthily of God? one may perhaps answer that He is just. Another more gifted would say that this word, too, is surpassed by His excellence, and that this, too, is said not worthily of Him, although suitably according to man's capacity: so that, when he would prove out of Scripture that it is written *God is just,* he may be answered rightly, that the same Scriptures say that *God repenteth;* so that, as he does not take that in its ordinary meaning, as men are wont to repent, so also when He is said to be just, this does not correspond to His supereminence, although Scripture said this also well, that, through these words such as they are, we may be brought to that which is unutterable. "Why predictest thou," asks S. Chrysostome, the terrible things Thou art about to do? That I may not do what I predict. Wherefore also He threatened hell, that He may not bring to hell. Let words terrify you, that ye may be freed from the anguish of deeds." "Men threaten punishment and inflict it. Not so God; but contrariwise, He both predicts and delays, and terrifies with words, and leaves nothing undone, that He may not bring what He threatens. So He did with the Ninevites. He bends His bow, and brandishes His sword, and prepares His spear, and inflicts not the blow. Were not the prophet's words bow, and spear, and sharp sword when he said, *yet forty days and Nineveh shall be destroyed?* But He discharged not the shaft; for it was prepared, not to be shot, but to be laid up."†

* S. Aug. † Ib.

"When we read in the Scriptures or hear in churches the word of God, what do we hear but Christ? *And behold a greater than Jonas is here.* If they repented at the cry of one unknown servant, of what punishment shall not we be worthy, if, when the Lord preacheth, whom we have known through so many benefits heaped upon us, we repent not? To them one day sufficed; to us shall so many months and years not suffice? To them the overthrow of the city was preached, and forty days were granted for repentance: to us eternal torments are threatened, and we have not half an hour's life certain."*

And He did it not. God willed rather that His prophesy should seem to fail, than that repentance should fail of its fruit. But it did not, indeed, fail, for the condition lay expressed in the threat. "Prophesy," says Aquinas, in reference to these cases, "can not contain any thing untrue." For "prophesy is a certain knowledge impressed on the understanding of the Prophets by revelation of God, by means of certain teaching. But truth of knowledge is the same in the teacher and the taught, because the knowledge of the learner is a likeness of the knowledge of the teacher. And in this way, Jerome saith that 'prophesy is a sort of sign of Divine foreknowledge.' The truth, then, of the prophetic knowledge and utterance must be the same as that of the Divine knowledge, in which there can be no error. But although in the Divine Intellect, the twofold knowledge [of things as they are in themselves, and as they are in their causes,] is always united, it is not always united in the prophetic revelation, because the impression made by the Agent is not always adequate to His power. Whence, sometimes, the prophetic revelation is a sort of impressed likeness of the Divine Foreknowledge, as it beholds the future contingent things in themselves, and these always take place as they are prophesied: as, *Behold a virgin shall conceive.* But sometims the prophetic revelation is an impressed likeness of Divine foreknowledge, as it knows the order of causes to effects; and then at times the event is other than is foretold, and yet there is nothing untrue in the prophesy. For the meaning of the prophesy is, that the disposition of the inferior causes, whether in nature or in human acts, is such, that such an effect would follow," (as in regard to Hezekiah and Nineveh,) "which

---

* R[illegible]

order of the cause to the effect is sometimes hindered by other things supervening." "The Will of God," he says again, "being the first universal Cause, does not exclude intermediate causes, by virtue of which certain effects are produced. And, since all intermediate causes are not adequate to the power of the First Cause, there are many things in the Power, Knowledge, and Will of God which are not contained in the order of the inferior causes, as the resurrection of Lazarus. Whence one, looking to the inferior causes, might say, 'Lazarus will not rise again;' whereas, looking to the first Divine Cause, he could say, 'Lazarus will rise again.' And each of these God willeth, viz.: that a thing should take place according to the inferior cause, which yet shall not take place, according to the superior cause: and conversely. So that God sometimes pronounces that a thing shall be, as far as it is contained in the order of inferior causes, (as, according to the disposition of nature or deserts,) which yet doth not take place, because it is otherwise in the superior Divine cause. As when He foretold to Hezekiah, *Set thy house in order, for thou shalt die and not live;* which yet did not take place, because, from eternity it was otherwise in the Knowledge and Will of God, which is unchangeable. Whence Gregory saith, 'though God changeth the thing, His counsel He doth not change.' When, then, He saith, *I will repent*, it is understood as said metaphorically; for men, when they fulfill not what they threatened, seem to repent."

Chapter IV.

1. *And Jonah was displeased exceedingly.* It was an untempered zeal. The prophet himself records it as such, and how he was reproved for it. He would, like many of us, govern God's world better than God Himself. Short-sighted and presumptuous. Yet not more short-sighted than those who, in fact, quarrel with God's Providence, the existence of evil, the baffling of good, "the prison-walls of obstacles and trials," in what we would do for God's glory. What is all discontent but anger with God? The marvel is that the rebel was a prophet! "What he desired was not unjust in itself, that the Ninevites should be punished for their past sins, and that the sentence of God pronounced against them should not be recalled, although they repented. For so the judge hangs the robber for theft, however he repent."* He

* Lap.

sinned, in that he disputed with God. Let *him* cast the first stone who never rejoiced at any overthrow of the enemies of his country, nor was glad, in a common warfare, that they lost as many soldiers as we. As if God had not instruments enough at His Will! Or, as if He needed the Assyrians to punish Israel, or the one nation, whose armies are the terror of Europe, to punish us, so that if they should perish, Israel should therefore have escaped, though it persevered in sin, or we!

And he was very angry, or, it may be, *very grieved.* The word expresses, also, the emotion of burning grief, as when Samuel was grieved at the rejection of Saul, or David at *the breach upon Uzzah.* Either way, he was displeased with what God did. Yet so Samuel and David took God's doings to heart; but Samuel and David were grieved at God's judgments; Jonah, at what to the Ninevites was mercy, only in regard to his own people it seemed to involve judgment. Scripture says that he was displeased because the Ninevites were spared, but not why this displeased him. It has been thought that it was jealousy for God's glory among these heathen, as though the Ninevites would think that God, in whose name he spake, had no certain knowledge of things to come; and so that his fault was mistrust in God's Wisdom or Power to vindicate his own honor. But it seems more likely that it was a mistaken patriotism, which idolized the well-being of his own and God's people, and desired that its enemy, the appointed instrument of its chastisement, should be itself destroyed. Scripture being silent about it, we can not know certainly. Jonah, under God's inspiration, relates that God pronounced him wrong. Having incurred God's reproof, he was careless about men's judgment, and left his own character open to the harsh judgment of men, teaching us a holy indifference to man's opinion, and, in our ignorance, carefulness not to judge unkindly.

2. *And he prayed unto the Lord.* Jonah, at least, did not murmur or complain of God. He complained to God of himself. He expostulates with Him. Short-sighted, indeed, and too wedded to his own will! Yet his will was the well-being of the people whose prophet God had made him. He tells God that this it was which he had all along dreaded. He softens it as well as he can by his word, *I pray Thee*, which expresses deprecation and submissiveness. Still, he does not hesitate to tell God that this was the cause of his first rebellion. Perilous to the soul, to speak with-

out penitence of former sin; yet it is to God that he speaks, and so God, in His wonderful condescension, makes him teach himself.

I know that Thou art a gracious God. He repeats to God, to the letter, His own words by Joel. God had so revealed Himself anew to Judah. He had, doubtless, on some repentance which Judah had used, turned away the evil from them. And now, by sending him as a preacher of repentance, He implied that He would do the same to the enemies of his country. God confirms this by the whole sequel. Thenceforth, then, Israel knew that to the heathen, also, God was intensely, infinitely full of gracious and yearning love;* nay, (as the form rather implies) mastered, so to speak, by the might and intensity of His gracious love, *slow to anger*, and delaying it; *great in loving tenderness*, and abounding in it; and that toward them also, when the evil is about to be inflicted, or has been partially or wholly inflicted, He will repent of it and replace it with good, on the first turning of the soul or the nation to God.

3. *Therefore, now, O Lord, take, I beseech thee, my life from me.* He had rather die than see the evil which was to come upon his country. Impatient though he was, he still cast himself upon God. By asking of God to end his life, he, at least, committed himself to the sovereign disposal of God. "Seeing that the Gentiles are, in a manner, entering in, and that those words are being fulfilled, *they have moved me to jealousy with* that which is *not God, and I will move them to jealousy with* those which are *not a people, I will provoke them to anger with a foolish nation*, he despairs of the salvation of Israel, and is convulsed with great sorrow, which bursts out into words, and sets forth the causes of grief, saying in a manner, 'Am I alone chosen, out of so many prophets, to announce destruction to my people through the salvation of others?' He grieved not, as some think, that the multitude of nations is saved, but that Israel perishes. Whence our Lord also wept over Jerusalem. The Apostles first preached to Israel. Paul wisheth to become an anathema for his *brethren, who are Israelites, whose is the adoption and the glory and the covenant, and the giving of the law and the service of God, and the promises, whose are the fathers, and of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ* came."† Jonah had discharged his office faithfully

* Both words in Hebrew are intensive, and, although adjectives, partake of the passive form.

† S. Jer.

now; he had done what God commanded; God had done by him what He willed. Now, then, he prays to be discharged. So S. Augustine, in his last illness, prayed that he might die before the Vandals brought suffering and devastation on his country.

4. *And the Lord said, doest thou well to be angry?* God being appealed to, answers the appeal. So does He often in prayer, by some secret voice, answer the inquirer. There is right anger against the sin. Moses's anger was right when he broke the tables. God secretly suggests to Jonah that *his* was not right, as our Lord instructed S. James and S. John that *theirs* was not. The question relates to the quality, not the greatness of his anger. It was not the vehemence of his passionate desire *for* Israel which God reproves, but that it was turned *against* the Ninevites. "What the Lord says to Jonah, He says to all who, in their office of the cure of souls, are angry. They must, as to this same anger, be recalled into themselves, to regard the cause or object of their anger, and weigh warily and attentively whether they *do well to be angry.* For if they are angry, not with men but with the sins of men, if they hate and persecute, not men but the vices of men, they are rightly angry, their zeal is good. But if they are angry, not with sins but with men, if they hate, not vices but men, they are angered amiss, their zeal is bad. This, then, which was said to one, is to be watchfully looked to and decided by all. *Doest thou well to be angry?*"*

5. *So Jonah went out of the city.*† The form of the words implies, (as in the Eng. V.) that this took place after Jonah was convinced that God would spare Nineveh; and since there is no intimation that he knew it by revelation, then it was probably after the forty days. "The days being now past, after which it was time that the things foretold should be accomplished, and His anger as yet taking no effect, Jonah understood that God had pity on Nineveh. Still he does not give up all hope, and thinks that a respite of the evil has been granted them, on their willingness to repent, but that some effect of His displeasure would come, since the pains of their repentance had not equaled their offenses. So thinking in himself apparently, he departs from the city, and waits to see what will become of them."‡ "He expected," apparently, "that it would either fall by an earthquake, or be burned with fire,

---

* Rup. † Some render, contrary to grammar, *And Jonah had gone*, etc. ‡ S. Cyr.

like Sodom." "Jonah, in that he built him a tabernacle and sat over against Nineveh, awaiting what should happen to it, wore a different, foresignifying character. For he prefigured the carnal people of Israel. For these, too, were sad at the salvation of the Ninevites; *i. e.*, the redemption and deliverance of the Gentiles. Whence Christ came to call, not the righteous but sinners to repentance. But the overshadowing gourd over his head was the promises of the Old Testament, or those offices in which, as the Apostle says, there was *a shadow of good things to come*, protecting them in the land of promise from temporal evils; all which are now emptied and faded. And now that people, having lost the temple at Jerusalem, and the priesthood and sacrifice (all which was a shadow of that which was to come) in its captive dispersion, is scorched by a vehement heat of tribulations, as Jonah by the heat of the sun, and grieves greatly; and yet the salvation of the heathen and the penitent is accounted of more moment than its grief, and the shadow which it loved."*

6. *And the Lord God prepared a gourd*, [*a palm-christ*, E. M. rightly.] "God again commanded the gourd, as He did the whale, willing only that this should be. Forthwith it springs up beautiful and full of flower, and straightway was a roof to the whole booth, shadowing it like a bower, to his exceeding comfort. The prophet rejoices at it exceedingly, as being a great and thankworthy thing. See now herein, too, the simplicity of his mind. He was grieved exceedingly, because what he had prophesied came not to pass; he rejoiced exceedingly for a plant. A blameless mind is lightly moved to gladness or sorrow. You will see this in children. For as people who are not strong easily fall, if some one gives them no very strong push, but touches them, as it were, with a lighter hand, so, too, the guileless mind is easily carried away by any thing which impels or grieves it."† Little as the shelter of the palm-christ was in itself, Jonah must have looked upon its sudden growth as a fruit of God's goodness toward him, (as it was,) and then, perhaps, went on to think (as people do) that this favor of God showed that He meant, in the end, to grant him what his heart was set upon. Those of impulsive temperaments are ever interpreting the acts of God's Providence as bearing on what they strongly desire. Or, again, they argue, 'God throws this or that

---

* S. Aug. † S. Cyr.

in our way; therefore He means us not to relinquish it for His sake, but to have it." By this sudden miraculous shelter against the burning Assyrian sun, which God provided for Jonah, He favored his waiting on there. So Jonah may have thought, interpreting rightly that God willed him to stay; wrongly, why He so willed. Jonah was to wait, not to see what he desired, but to receive, and be the channel of the instruction which God meant to convey to him and through him.

7. *When the morning rose; i. e.*, in the earliest dawn, before the actual sunrise. For one day, Jonah enjoyed the refreshment of the palm-christ. In early dawn, it still promised the shadow; just ere it was most needed, at God's command, it withered.

8. *God prepared a vehement* [E. M. following the Chaldee, *silent; i. e.*, sultry,] *East wind.* The winds in the East, blowing over the sand-deserts, intensely increase the distress of the heat. A sojourner [Layard] describes, on two occasions, an Assyrian summer. "The change to summer had been as rapid as that which ushered in the spring. The verdure of the plain had perished almost in a day. Hot winds, coming from the desert, had burnt up and carried away the shrubs. The heat was now almost intolerable. Violent whirlwinds occasionally swept over the face of the country." "The spring was now fast passing away; the heat became daily greater; the corn was cut; and the plains and hills put on their summer clothing of dull, parched yellow. *The pasture is withered, the herbage faileth; the green grass is not.* It was the season, too, of the Sherghis, or burning winds from the south, which occasionally swept over the face of the country, driving, in their short-lived fury, every thing before them. We all went below [ground] soon after the sun had risen, and remained there [in the tunnel] without again seeking the open air until it was far down in the western horizon." The "Sherghi" must be rather the east wind, Sherki, whence Siroceo. At Sulimania in Koordistan, (about $2\frac{1}{2}$ degrees east of Nineveh, and $\frac{3}{4}$ of a degree south,) "the so much dreaded Sherki seems to blow from any quarter, from east to north-east. It is greatly feared for its violence and relaxing qualities;" "hot, stormy, and singularly relaxing and dispiriting." Suffocating heat is a characteristic of these vehement winds. Morier relates, at Bushire: "A gale of wind blew from the southward and eastward with such violence that three of our largest tents were leveled with the ground. The

wind brought with it such hot currents of air that we thought it might be the precursor of the *Samoun*, described by Chardin, but upon inquiry, we found that the autumn was generally the season for that wind. The *Sam* wind commits great ravages in this district. It blows at night, from about midnight to sunrise, comes in a hot blast, and is afterward succeeded by a cold one. About six years ago, there was a *Sam* during the summer months, which so totally burnt up all the corn, then near its maturity, that no animal would eat a blade of it, nor touch any of its grain."

The sun beat upon the head of Jonah. "Few European travelers can brave the perpendicular rays of an Assyrian sun. Even the well-seasoned Arab seeks the shade during the day, and journeys by night, unless driven forth at noontide by necessity, or the love of war."

He wished in himself to die. [Lit. *he asked, as to his soul, to die.*] He prayed for death. It was still the same dependence upon God, even in his self-will. He did not murmur, but prayed God to end his life here. When men are already vexed in soul by deep inward griefs, a little thing often oversets patience. Jonah's hopes had been revived by the mercy of the palm-christ; they perished with it. Perhaps he had before him the thought of his great predecessor, Elijah; how he, too, wished to die, when it seemed that his mission was fruitless. They differed in love. Elijah's preaching, miracles, toil, sufferings, seemed to him not only to be in vain, but (as they must, if in vain,) to add to the guilt of his people. God corrected him, too, by showing him his own short-sightedness, that he knew not of *the seven thousand who had not bowed their knees unto Baal*, who were, in part, doubtless, *the travail of his soul.* Jonah's mission to his people seemed also to be fruitless; his hopes for their well-being were at an end; the temporal mercies of which he had been the Prophet were exhausted; the future scourge of his people was maintained in might. The soul shrinks into itself at the sight of the impending visitation of its country. But Elijah's zeal was *for* his people only, and the glory of God in it, and so it was pure love. Jonah's was directed *against* the Ninevites, and so had to be purified.

9. *Doest thou well to be angry?* "See again how Almighty God, out of His boundless loving-kindness, with the yearning tenderness of a father, almost disporteth with the simplicity of holy souls! He shades him by a palm-christ: the Prophet rejoices in

it exceedingly. Then, in God's providence, the caterpillar attacks it, the burning east wind smites it, shewing at the same time how very necessary the relief of its shade, that the Prophet might be the more grieved when deprived of such a good. He asketh him, skillfully, was he very grieved, and that for a shrub? He confesseth, and this becometh the defense for God, the Lover of mankind."

I do well to be angry unto death. "Vehement anger leadeth men to long and love to die, especially if thwarted and unable to remove the hindrance which angers them. For then vehement anger begetteth vehement sorrow, grief, despondency." We have each his own palm-christ; and our palm-christ has its own worm. "In Jonah, who mourned when he had discharged his office, we see those who, in what they seem to do for God, either do not seek the glory of God, but some end of their own, or at least think that glory to lie where it does not. For he who seeketh the glory of God, and not his *own* things, but those of Jesus Christ, ought to will what God hath willed and done. If he wills aught else, he declares plainly that he sought himself, not God, or himself more than God. Jonah sought the glory of God wherein it was not, in the fulfillment of a prophesy of woe. And choosing to be led by his own judgment, not by God's, whereas he ought to have joyed exceedingly, that so many thousands, being *dead, were alive again*, being *lost, were found*, he, when *there was joy in heaven among the angels of God over* so many repenting sinners, was *afflicted with a great affliction*, and was angry. This ever befalls those who wish *that* to take place, not what is best and most pleasing to God, but what they think most useful to themselves. Whence we see our *very* great and common error, who think our peace and tranquillity to lie in the fulfillment of our own will, whereas this will and judgment of our own is the cause of all our trouble. So then Jonah prays and tacitly blames God, and would not so much excuse as approve that, his former flight, to *Him whose eyes are too pure to behold iniquity.* And since all inordinate affection is a punishment to itself, and he who departeth from the order of God hath no stability, he is in such anguish because what he wills will not be, that he longs to die. For it can not but be that *his* life, who measures every thing by his own will and mind, and who followeth not God as his Guide, but rather willeth to be the guide of the Divine Will, should be,

from time to time, troubled with great sorrow. But since the merciful and gracious Lord hath pity on our infirmity, and gently admonisheth us within, when He sees us at variance with Him, He forsakes not Jonah in that hot grief, but lovingly blames him. How restless such men are, we see from Jonah. The palm-christ grows over his head, and *he was exceedingly glad of the palm-christ.* Any labor or discomfort they bear very ill, and being accustomed to endure nothing, and follow their own will, they are tormented and can not bear it, as Jonah did not the sun. If any thing, however slight, happen to lighten their grief, they are immoderately glad. Soon gladdened, soon grieved, like children. They have not learned to bear any thing moderately. What marvel, then, that their joy is soon turned into sorrow? They are joyed over a palm-christ, which soon greeneth, soon drieth, quickly falls to the ground and is trampled upon. Such are the things of this world, which, while possessed, seem great and lasting; when suddenly lost, men see how vain and passing they are, and that hope is to be placed, not in them, but in their Creator, who is unchangeable. It is, then, a great dispensation of God toward us, when those things in which we took especial pleasure are taken away. Nothing can man have so pleasing, green, and, in appearance, so lasting, which has not its own worm prepared by God, whereby, in the dawn, it may be smitten and die. The change of human will or envy disturbs court favor; manifold accidents, wealth; the varying opinion of the people or the great, honors; disease, danger, poverty, infamy, pleasure. Jonah's palm-christ had one worm; ours many; if the other were wanting, there is the restlessness of man's own thoughts, whose food is restlessness."

10. *Thou hadst pity on the palm-christ.* In the feeling of our common mortality, the soul can not but yearn over decay. Even a drooping flower is sad to look on, so beautiful, so frail. It belongs to this passing world, where nothing lovely abides, all things beautiful hasten to cease to be. The natural God-implanted feeling is the germ of the spiritual.

11. *Should I not spare?* lit. *have pity* and so *spare.* God waives for the time the fact of the repentance of Nineveh, and speaks of those on whom man must have pity, those who never had any share in its guilt, the one hundred and twenty thousand children of Nineveh, "who, in the weakness of infancy, knew

not which hand, *the right* or *the left*, is the stronger and fitter for every use." He who would have spared Sodom *for ten's sake*, might well be thought to spare Nineveh for the one hundred and twenty thousand's sake, in whom the inborn corruption had not developed into the malice of willful sin. If these one hundred and twenty thousand were the children under three years old, they were one-fifth (as is calculated) of the whole population of Nineveh. If of the six hundred thousand of Nineveh, all were guilty, who by reason of age could be, above one-fifth were innocent of actual sin.

To Jonah, whose eye was evil to Nineveh for his people's sake, God says, as it were, "Let the *spirit* which *is willing* say to the *flesh* which *is weak*, *Thou grievest for the palm-christ;* that is, thine own kindred, the Jewish people; and *shall not I spare Nineveh that great city*, shall not I provide for the salvation of the Gentiles in the whole world, who are in ignorance and error? For there are many thousands among the Gentiles, who go after *dumb idols even as they are led;* not out of malice but out of ignorance, who would without doubt correct their ways, if they had the knowledge of the truth, if they were shown the difference *between their right hand and their left; i. e.*, between the truth of God and the lie of men." But, beyond the immediate teaching to Jonah, God lays down a principle of His dealings at all times, that, in His visitations of nations, He, *the Father of the fatherless and judge of the widows*, takes especial account of those who are of no account in man's sight, and defers the impending judgment, not for the sake of the wisdom of the wise or the courage of the brave, but for the helpless, weak, and, as yet, innocent as to actual sin. How much more may we think that He regards those with pity who have on them not only the recent uneffaced traces of their Maker's hands, but have been reborn in the image of Christ His only-begotten Son? The infants clothed with Christ must be a special treasure of the Church in the eyes of God.

How much greater the mercy of God than that even of a holy man; how far better to flee to the judgment-seat of God than to the tribunal of man. Had Jonah been judge in the cause of the Ninevites, he would have passed on them all, although penitent, the sentence of death for their past guilt, because God had passed it before their repentance. So David said to God: *Let us fall now into the hand of the Lord; for His mercies are great; and let*

me not fall into the hand of man. Whence the Church professes to God, that mercy is the characteristic of His power; O God, who shewest Thy Almighty power most chiefly in shewing mercy and pity, mercifully grant unto us such a measure of Thy grace, that we, running the way of Thy commandments, may obtain Thy gracious promises, and be made partakers of Thy heavenly treasure."

"Again, God here teaches Jonah and us all to conform ourselves in all things to the Divine Will, that, when He commandeth any work, we should forthwith begin and continue it with alacrity and courage. When he bids us cease from it, or deprives it of its fruit and effect, we should forthwith tranquilly cease, and patiently allow our work and toil to lack its end and fruit. For what is our aim, save to do the Will of God, and in all things to conform ourselves to it? But now the Will of God is, that thou shouldest resign, yea destroy, the work thou hast begun. Acquiesce then in it. Else thou servest not the Will of God, but thine own fancy and cupidity. And herein consists the perfection of the holy soul, that, in all acts and events, adverse or prosperous, it should with full resignation resign itself most humbly and entirely to God, and acquiesce, happen what will, yea, and rejoice that the Will of God is fulfilled in this thing, and say with holy Job, *The Lord gave, the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the Name of the Lord.* S. Ignatius had so transferred his own will into the Will of God, that he said, 'If, perchance, the society, which I have begun and furthered with such toil, should be dissolved or perish, after passing half an hour in prayer, I should, by God's help, have no trouble from this thing, than which none sadder could befall me.' The saints let themselves be turned this way and that, round and round, by the Will of God, as a horse by its rider."

THE LOGICAL RESULT OF THE NATURALISTIC PHILOSOPHY.*

BY J. I. DOEDES, D. D., PROFESSOR IN UTRECHT.

THE struggle of our times turns upon the reality of the supernatural. On the one hand the credibility of the miracles recorded in the Gospels is maintained; on the other side it is denied. While it is admitted on both sides that the question respects the history of Christ, the parties are in the most direct antagonism to each other as to what, in the life of Jesus, is to be regarded as really historical. Miracle or no miracle? that is the question. The supernatural, in union with the natural, or every thing simply natural, and the supernatural excluded as not being historical, is the point in controversy; and with this, the result of the inquiry in respect to the genuineness of the historical books of the New Testament stands in connection, just as the issue of the inquiry into the genuineness and credibility of the books of the Old Testament, is, at last, for the most part, determined by the position taken in respect to the miracles it relates.

When will the controversy in respect to miracles and the supernatural be ended? On the side of those who reject them, it is replied: just so soon as the actual occurrence of a miracle shall be satisfactorily demonstrated. What should we do, it is asked, if, some day, a worker of miracles should appear, claiming, for example, to be able to raise the dead, and a serious consideration of his claim could be regarded as possible? A commission of physiologists, physicists, chemists, and persons skilled in historical criticism, should be appointed. This commission should select the body, satisfy themselves that death had really occurred in the case, designate the hall in which the experiment should be made, and, in short, take every precaution which might be necessary to exclude all doubt. If, under such conditions, the dead should be raised, there would be a probability nearly akin to certainty. Nevertheless, since an experiment must always be capable of repetition, and in the case of miracles there can be no place for the distinction between "easy" and "difficult," the worker of

---

* Translated from *Stemmen voor Waarheid en Vrede* for September, 1865.

miracles should be required to repeat his miracle, in other circumstances, upon other bodies, and at another place. If the miracle should be wrought in every case, two particulars would be proved: the first, that supernatural events have occurred in the world; the other, that the power of causing them to appear is given to certain persons. But who does not see, it is said in the last place, that never in these circumstances has a miracle occurred? that always, down to the present day, the miracle-worker has chosen the subject, the place, and the witnesses?

In respect to the latter point, the answer is at hand, and can be made at once. According to the narratives of the miracles of Jesus, this can not be affirmed without limitations: according to the account of the resurrection of Lazarus, it was certainly not Jesus who chose the subject, the place, or the witnesses. But it will be of slight use to insist upon this point, since the credibility of the narrative will still be denied. We prefer to take our stand on the two particulars which, it is claimed, would be proved, if the miracle of the resurrection of the dead were repeated under the conditions named; and really we can not repress our astonishment at the credulity of those who, in the case supposed, should regard the two particulars as really proved. How? Because a so-called wonder-worker, in the presence of men of science, does, more than once, wake a dead person to life, are we to assume it as proved that supernatural, mark well, *supernatural* events occur in the world; *i. e.*, events which can not possibly be explained by causes lying within in the sphere of nature! A different conclusion is certainly possible; viz., that some men possess the power of doing what others can not do, and, accordingly, that there are powers and laws of nature which, down to the present time, have been discovered only by certain persons—the so-called miracle-workers—and not by ordinary physiologists, physicists, chemists, etc. Even after one or another worker of miracles had three, four, or five times changed a corpse into a living body, if I held the position of Renan, (for his view it is that we are now considering,) I should by no means surrender, but sturdily say; the supernatural is the superdivine, and, therefore, not to be spoken of: if ever a dead man be really restored to life, we must, in the end, be able to explain it on natural grounds.

But there is something further to be taken into consideration.

By the supposition, the proposed commission certify that the wonder-worker has really performed the so-called supernatural deed. Shall other physiologists, physicists, chemists, who were not members of the commission, and were not present at the experiment, believe, and must they believe, that it is possible, at least for some persons to change a corpse into a living being, and therefore conclude that it is possible for supernatural events to occur? Why should they not, you perhaps ask, if they hold the members of the commission to be competent, honorable, and impartial judges? Why not! Because many, in respect to miracles, have something more to say than that they are not properly attested. What think you of the materialists? According to them, every thing must be explained by the changes of matter. So long as it is not proved to them that the resurrection of a dead person can be explained by the laws of material changes, they will refuse to recognize, as a fact, his alleged return to life. What think you of the naturalist? Can he, holding, as he does, that there is nothing above nature, recognize any thing as supernatural? What think you of pantheism? In this system there is no room for the supernatural as something which can not be explained by natural causes. Even though the existence of a personal God be admitted, no obligation will be felt on that account to recognize Renan's pretended proof, exhibited in the presence of his proposed commission. On the ground of deism, no farther point is ultimately reached, so far as the recognition of the supernatural goes, than on that of materialism, naturalism, and pantheism; and on the theistic ground—but we know that among those who defend theism, and consequently conceive of the personal God as in constant connection with the universe, there are violent opposers of miracles and of every thing supernatural. We are reminded that it is possible to recognize a personal God, who is distinguished from the world, from all finite and individual things, by his infinity and his own consciousness of it, without being obliged to assume an interposition on his part, as if he was separated from the universe which, just as it is, is, with its immutable laws, the revelation itself of God. The so-called Monistic Theism is distinguished, as we know, from Deism by the assumption of an inner relation of God to the universe, and from the supernaturalistic Theism by the denial of the transcendence of God in respect to the universe. The universe, says the

Theist who defends Monism, is, with its unchangeable laws, the revelation of God. A variation from these laws is not to be admitted, for the laws are the expression of God's will; any thing deviating from them can not possibly be ascribed to God, who is immanent in the world. So long as the Theist, who stands on the ground of Monism, does not see the return to life of a dead person really occurring before his eyes, he will never be able to recognize it as a fact; or, if he is compelled to do so, he will never refer it to a "supernatural" cause, and never recognize in it a "supernatural" fact.

We must not shut our eyes against the ultimate ground on which miracles and every thing supernatural are denied. It is not the insufficiency of the evidence for the actual occurrence of miracles, but the *naturalistic theory of the universe*, in which materialists, pantheists, and monists essentially agree, and which by an inexorable necessity excludes the supernatural in nature and history. Their difficulty is not, in the last analysis, that miracles are not properly or satisfactorily attested; but that they do not fit into the world or the universe; *i. e.*, into *their theory* and apprehension of the system of the world or the universe. Rather than sacrifice these theories, these men endeavor to save them by hypotheses the moment that phenomena and facts appear which can not be harmonized with their speculations: witness the development hypothesis in its various forms, by which the origin of organized creatures from the inorganic creation, it is claimed, must be explained. It has been asked of what use it is to have proved that God can come between the two, or interpose in the natural development of things, when it is impossible to bring forward a single fact which has ever demonstrably proceeded from any such intervention or interposition *ex abrupto*. We admit that, if the demonstration of such an event is really impossible, the proof of the possibility of a divine intervention—that is, of the supernatural—amounts to nothing. But we ask, at just this point, whether, viewing the organic and inorganic creation in the full light of the results of scientific inquiry, we have the right to affirm that it is impossible (mark well, *impossible*) to bring forward a single fact which demonstrably proceeded not from a natural cause but from a supernatural interposition? Let men be entirely honest, and not hide behind what evidently can not, in the slightest degree, be assumed in advance; viz., "not yet

properly attested." This is really not the great difficulty; it lies elsewhere—namely, in the naturalistic philosophy; and, therefore, a hundred trials, however successful they might be, and performed, albeit, before a hundred competent commissions—commissions, too, which Renan would pronounce competent—of materialists, naturalists, pantheists, or monistic theists, would never insure the acceptance of a single fact or phenomenon as supernatural. If this result should ever be secured, it would certainly be not upon the testimony of others, however competent, but upon the evidence of one's own senses. I remember to have read somewhere in the writings of Dr. Reville, "How many poor souls would be relieved of the anguish of skepticism, how many hardened unbelievers would be converted and saved, if, some morning, the telegraph should startle Europe with the announcement that the French Institute had felt constrained to regard a miracle as having been actually performed! "But supposing such a telegram to be every-where sent, it is very probable that at least the "hardened unbelievers" would say, "As I did not see it myself, I will not believe it;" and if they should see it themselves, they would say, "It is incomprehensible certainly, but supernatural it can not be; the cause must be sought within the sphere of nature."

Consequently, to the question, when the struggle respecting miracles and the supernatural will be terminated, we are compelled to answer: not till men shall bid farewell to the naturalistic philosophy, and recognize the supernatural in accordance with its just claims.

But perhaps it is asked: is it worth the while to dispute so much upon the occurrence or non-occurrence of miracles? Of what importance is it, in the end, at least to the Christian theologian, whether the naturalistic or supernaturalistic philosophy be accepted? If men only stand upon the theistic ground and recognize a personal God, distinct from the world and yet immanent in the world, why insist upon the recognition of the supernatural, both in nature and history?

We would not, in the slightest degree, undervalue the importance of the recognition of a personal God to Christian theology. If the personality of God is denied, theology is at once annihilated: nay, more, religion (*godsdienst*, the worship of *God*) becomes impossible, because then it is nothing more than the adora-

tion of a conception, a principle, or an ideal. Religion presupposes, if we do not trifle with words, not only man, but a personal God; that is, a being who possesses self-consciousness. But religion presupposes more than this. It presupposes that man is something else than a being *determined* in his acts by laws independent of himself. It presupposes that man voluntarily consecrates and devotes himself to God; that he voluntarily obeys and glorifies Him. On this voluntariness, Christianity lays the strongest emphasis. The Apostolic Gospel, through the acceptance and preaching of which Christianity exerts its power, presupposes voluntariness. In calling men to faith, conversion, and holiness, it assumes to be speaking to men, who are responsible for their actions; who are worthy of punishment on account of their sins, and who, in consequence of the impurity of their hearts, stand in need of renewal. It appeals to their consciences and points out a way which they must enter, in order to come into the right relation to God. For this Gospel the naturalistic philosophy has no place, even though its adherents pay no homage to materialism, or naturalism, or pantheism, or deism, but recognize a personal God. For, notwithstanding this, they assume that all things are governed by immutable laws, by immutable laws must be explained, and by immutable laws come into being: and then they say, every thing that takes place is God's work, and—this is a necessary result—*is good*. Moral evil, they go on to say, is just like physical evil, willed by God, not indeed to be permanent, but to be subdued by an opposing force; yet in its existence in time, it is willed by God. The ideas expressed by the terms *good* and *evil*, in contrast with each other, are merely relative. In the sight of God there is no evil. God is the absolute cause even of the evil desires by which men are impelled to injure each other—the cause even of what we are accustomed to call "sin." Still, it is not God's will that sin should continue, and, therefore, he calls us to strive against it. To offer any explanation derived from the freedom of the human will is absurd. The recognition of God's omnipotence utterly excludes the assumption of free-will in man. Every event occurs in accordance with the law of cause and effect, under the all-embracing control of God. In the great whole which we call the world, there is less room for a free act of man than even for a miracle.

The determinism which makes these declarations is the entirely

logical development of the naturalistic philosophy. Every thing, without the slightest distinction, is referred back to one ultimate cause, God. Every thing is explained by natural causes which have their absolute cause, finally, in God. In the natural world there is no miracle—in the spiritual world no freedom of will pertaining to man. What else remains for the Gospel, we ask, with which Christianity appeared, except to regard itself as a superfluity?

The Gospel appeals incessantly to the human will. It exhorts and warns; it arouses and stimulates; it speaks as if it were saying, "you can if you will." The same thing indeed is said also by determinism and the naturalistic school. But there is one difference between them. The Gospel says that God works in us both to will and to do according to his good pleasure. This, too, determinism says. But with this difference, if man *will not*, this also is caused by God, says the determinist. But if man will not, we ask, does *then* the Gospel say that he is still acting according to the will of God? If man disobeys the Gospel, does not the Gospel, in that case, assume him to be worthy of punishment? Is the Gospel deterministic, in the same sense with naturalism, carried out to its logical result, even though standing on the ground of theism? No, a thousand times, no. And therefore it is evident what position the preacher of the Gospel must take in respect to the principle of the naturalistic philosophy, and what would finally become of religion if that philosophy should be accepted as true. If what we call sin is willed by God exactly like its opposite; if God is the author of one as well as the other, why should we call a man, at the moment he sins, less religious, less engaged in the service of God, than when he is not sinning? Why call him religious only in the latter case, when the whole idea of sin, as well as its opposite, is merely relative, and, in the sight of God, has no significance? To this result we must come, if the idea of religion is to be so defined as to be brought into harmony with this philosophy. Religion must in this case be independent of what we usually call sin: it must be regarded as simply the mental state or disposition possessed by the man who is deeply impressed with the idea that God reigns, and that he is wisdom and love—a state which, on this view, is neither excluded by, nor does it exclude, what passes under the name of sin. Here is a conflict between the naturalistic, especially the deterministic,

and the supernaturalistic, or Christian philosophy, and on this we must fix our attention if we would understand the great importance of the theological struggle before us, the radical difference between the two parties, and the vital interests at stake for theology, religion, and morals. In the naturalistic philosophy, the law of "continuity," whether observed or not, is always, and in all cases, assumed. In the material world, phenomena are found which can not be explained by natural laws; but no supernatural influence will it admit. In the sphere of history, according to certain records, events occur which can not be explained by natural causes; but the supernatural explanation it rejects and consequently denies that these events ever took place. In respect to man, we are ignorant of the causes of his volitions. But in view of his possession of conscience, and especially the consciousness of guilt which he manifests, we should be disposed to seek the cause in himself, and to make him responsible. No, no, exclaim our opponents, it is ultimately to be traced to God. So here, then, is no agency of man, as in the former case there was no agency of God. In the supernatural philosophy, on the contrary, the principle of continuity or invariable sequence is not made supreme, but a fair consideration is given to what the material world itself declares in respect to an interposition by a higher power; it does not shut its eye upon the testimony of history; it starts back from the idea of making God the author of sin, or seeking the cause of human volitions, without distinction, in God, or surrendering the doctrine of man's responsibility to his Maker, as indicated by his consciousness of guilt. Its adherents compelled to enter into such a controversy, accept it in courage and hope. The natural world will not be to them a sealed book. To the wide and rich field of history they will direct their studies, but most of all to the center of all history, the age, the appearing of Jesus Christ. We must also especially study man; man, particularly as a moral and religious being; man, with his need of religion and of life in communion with a personal God, and with conscience which is so inexplicable on the assumption that the causes of his volitions lie wholly outside of himself. The final and inevitable conclusion to which we are brought is, that we must take our choice between a naturalistic philosophy, with its logical results, and the Gospel of Jesus and the Apostles, and that there is and can be no middle course.

SIMEON ON THE MANAGEMENT OF A TEXT AND SERMON.*

Take it in the writer's meaning, and not as a motto. Of course, there may be some very exceptional case in which you must have a motto, and in which, as a motto, the text may do good. Get the subject of your text, and use the words only as your machinery. Do not fritter a text down, but in your management let the subject of it stand out clear, and as a whole. Suppose, for instance, the text (Gal. v: 1), "Stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free." Arrange it thus: 1st. The liberty into which Christ has brought us; and, 2nd. The duty arising therefrom. In this mode, the subject would be entire, and you might, in a side way, show who brings us into liberty; how He does it, and what are its effects. And, in speaking of our duty, you could show that it is to stand fast; and, as an illustration, could run back to the state of the Galatian church, etc. But all your thoughts and remarks should take their complexion from those of the Apostle in the text. Suppose, on the contrary, you were to arrange it in another way; for instance, 1st. The liberty; 2nd. Who brought us into it; and, 3rd. Its proper effects—or any such division: you would fritter the Apostle's idea down, and, instead of a sermon on the *subject*, you would preach one upon the *words*, and leave your auditory to scramble for the Apostle's subject as they could.

Take up your subject fully and neatly. Let it turn out simply and neatly; beware of putting a limb here and a limb there, but let it be a complete body. The difference between doing this and disregarding it, is like the difference between light bread and heavy bread, where the materials, although the same in both, are less nutritive and more uncomfortable of digestion in one than in the other. Beware, as Bishop Wilkins says, of crumbling the bread of life: "break it fully and fairly." To take up and bring out the whole subject, "clean and simple," is the entire *art* of constructing a sermon.

---

*From *Recollections of the Conversation Parties* of the Rev. Charles Simeon, M. A. London, 1863.

The ancients thought that every block of marble had a statue in it, and that the sculptor had but to chip away the matter by which it was encrusted; nor could he make any other figure out of it. Just so has every text a subject in it. Catch the view of that subject, and you will bring from it a compact and well-proportioned sermon, easy and useful. Is the statue in a posture of fighting? Do not make it in a posture of sitting. Is it impassioned? Do not make it placid and serene.

Do not preach what *you* can tell. but what your people can receive. Suppose I have six narrow-mouthed glass bottles to fill. I have both a large pail, brimful of water, and a small tea-kettle, with a taper spout, also full of water. Which of the two shall I use in filling the narrow-mouthed bottles?

When you can not get at the full and real meaning of a text. leave it alone. Do not preach from an indistinct view of a passage.

Do not travel out of your text for a subject: for elucidation you must do so, but not for subject. Most men preach their text; see that you avoid this. Preach not your text, but the subject of the text. Take the subject of the text; illustrate it by the words of the text, but preach always the *subject* of it. Let you sermon come naturally out of your text, "*totus, tersus, atque rotundus*," like the kernel out of a hazel-nut; and not piecemeal, and, after much trouble to your hearers, like the kernel out of a walnut. Take hold of some point in a text which will give you a handle for the whole. Do not thrust in a handle, but find that which is already in the text. A sermon should be like a telescope: each successive division of it should be as an additional lens to bring the subject of your text nearer, and make it more distinct.

Every man who gives a new, apt, and important illustration of Scripture truth, confers a lasting benefit on the Church of Christ.

Observe the distinction in a sermon between division and distribution. The old writers were not well aware of this difference. For instance, Baxter, in one of his works, goes on, "Sixty-fifthly," as if any person could remember the sixty-four preceding heads. Yet, by attending to this simple distinction, you may have a hundred and fifty heads in your sermon without either confusion or obscurity. Only do not *name* the minute subdi-

visions of your sermons: it will confuse your hearers, especially if they have been a little inattentive. Let me illustrate this point. Take the human body; separate all its two hundred and fifty bones, and lay them promiscuously on a table: you see a confused heap of bones. You know their number, and that they are the bones of a human body; but have you any idea of the skeleton from what you see? *There* is division alone. Take now the bones of the head, and arrange them in one heap; do the like with the bones of the trunk, and the several members separately, laying each parcel in its proper place; you thus will obtain an idea of the skeleton, and, through that, of the human body. *There* is distribution.

Make your exordium always short and pointed, if you can, and get at once to the substance of your sermon. Thus, (John vi: 44), "No man can come to me except the Father, which hath sent me, draw him." Suppose you are preaching on such a subject. Make such a division of it as this: 1st. It is difficult; let us explain it. 2nd. It has been controverted; let us confirm it. 3rd. It is liable to abuse; let us guard it. Such an opening will be sure to interest a congregation.

Never weary your hearers by too long preaching: endeavour to rivet their attention on your message for a reasonable time; but remember that the mind, and especially among the generality of persons, or the uneducated, will only bear a certain amount of tension. When weariness or exhaustion comes upon people, there is very little chance of your doing them more good on that occasion. Whole ordinary congregations must not in this respect be judged of even by the capabilities of spiritually-minded individuals among them.

THE CRITICAL LABORS OF TISCHENDORF, AND HIS DISCOVERY OF THE SINAI MANUSCRIPT OF THE BIBLE.*

WRITTEN BY HIMSELF.

WHILST the German Evangelical Church Diet, held at Altenburg, in September, 1864, was considering the most recent literature connected with the life of Jesus, I was solicited, by honored friends, to address a word upon the subject to that great assembly. I complied, directing attention to the fact that Renan, of France, had been guilty of a grievous misrepresentation in the view presented of the Holy Land, and also expressing my conviction that the earliest history of the Church, as well as that of the sacred text, would furnish the best possible weapons against the attacks upon our Gospels. This brief address was well received. A reporter of the *Allgemeine Kirchenzeitung*, writing on the third of June of the present year, thus speaks of it: "The reporter ventures to affirm that nothing else was said which awoke so deep an interest as the few words of Tischendorf, for the simple reason, that he confined himself to a field in which, beyond all others, he was at home, and because, when history speaks, all philosophy must keep silence."

The circumstance that researches, carried through many years, have brought me to an intimate acquaintance with facts, from which the clearest light may be derived, bearing upon the great question which is now agitating Christendom, seemed to impose upon me the duty of publishing, in a fuller form, the compendious address at Altenburg. A pamphlet, produced in fulfillment of this duty, appeared in the middle of March of the present year. It excited so much attention, that in three weeks not a single one of two thousand copies remained. Translations into

---

*Translated from Dr. TISCHENDORF's essay entitled, *Wann wurden unsere Evangelien verfasst*, Leipsic, 1865, by Rev. HENRY SMITH, D. D., Professor in Lane Theological Seminary. This timely and important treatise, which has excited much attention in Europe, has been forwarded by the learned author to the Theological Eclectic, with permission to present a translation of it to American readers.

English and French were undertaken, and a second edition of the original appeared in the month of May.

About this time, the managers of the Zwickau Association for the publication of books for the people, expressed the wish that I should prepare, for their use, an edition of the work remodeled and better adapted to the popular mind. Notwithstanding the pressure of other important labors, I undertook the task. It was an opportunity which I had desired to speak to a circle of readers, to whom most of my writings are inaccessible, although, in fact, the ultimate and best fruits of my researches were designed for the benefit of the entire Christian community.

The little work which I herewith commit to the indulgent consideration of the reader, although inferior in popular tone to many other publications of the Association, will be found, I trust, universally intelligible. Its chief design is to demonstrate that *our venerable Gospels actually originated in the times of the Apostles, and that they were actually the works of the holy men whose names they bear.* At the same time it will give the reader a glimpse of one of the most interesting and important periods in the history of the Christian Church.

At the time when I undertook to adapt this little work to the benevolent design of the Association, its managers presented another special request—the request, namely, that I should attach to it a narrative of my researches, and particularly an account of the discovery of the Sinai Bible; a work to which the chief place of honor is due among the sources of proof employed in the present publication. It is true, indeed, that similar accounts have been given both by myself and others, yet it is quite possible they may never have met the eye of the majority of the patrons of the Association. In complying with this desire of the managers, I have only to express, on my part, the hope that the narration may not prove unprofitable to my readers.

After several of my youthful writings, among which were two theological prize essays, had been favorably received, I undertook, in the year 1839, to prepare an edition of the New Testament in Greek, the language in which the Apostles wrote. In this work I availed myself of the learned helps produced within the last three hundred years, for the restoration of the text to the state in which it left the hands of the Apostles. This edition of the New Testament was published in the autumn of the year

1840. In the progress of these labors, the conviction fastened itself upon me that the helps referred to, in order to the highest result, demanded a much more careful investigation than they had hitherto received; and I imposed upon myself the task of a new investigation of this character. This undertaking rendered necessary a considerable amount of travel, requiring not only much time, tact, and industry, but a large outlay of money as well. The last of these elements of success was wanting. The Theological Faculty of Leipsic had recommended the undertaking to the government of Saxony, but as this remained without result, they applied to Dr. Von Falkenstein, at the time the government representative at the University. The issue was, that the sum of one hundred thaler ($72) was paid to me for traveling expenses, and a like sum was promised for the following year. Upon such a pecuniary foundation, it certainly appeared impossible to rest an undertaking which demanded long scientific journeys to foreign lands. Nevertheless, I consoled myself with the maxim that God helps the bold, and gives success to the earnest-hearted. Clad in a coat which had not been paid for, I took my departure for Paris on the day of the Reformation festival, 1840. The journey, at that time, cost fifty thaler. With the remaining fifty, of which I was master, I reached Paris.

It is not my purpose, however, to weary the reader with tedious details. In Paris I found men who interested themselves in my undertaking. While I was making collections for the future, I was at the same time able to realize from my labors enough to satisfy the wants of the present. I was obliged not only to spend two years in researches, in the rich Parisian libraries, but to travel, for the same purpose, through Holland and England. In January, 1843, I went from Paris to Switzerland, and after a long residence in Basel, I traveled through Southern France and Italy, exploring the libraries in Rome and Naples, in Florence, Venice, and Modena, in Milan, Verona, and Turin. In April, 1844, I undertook a journey from Italy to the Orient; Egypt, with the Coptic convents upon the Natron lakes of the Lybian desert; Sinai, in the Arabian desert; Jerusalem, together with Bethlehem and St. Saba, on the Dead Sea; Nazareth, with its surroundings, east and west; Smyrna and Patmos; the island of John; Beirut, Constantinople, with the Prince Islands, and Athens. These were the chief points of my Oriental researches. After visting, on

my homeward journey, the libraries of Vienna and Munieh, I returned to Leipsie, in January, 1845.

This series of journeys had eost five thousand thaler. How a traveler, who had left Leipsie in 1840 with less than nothing, had obtained so considerable a sum, will appear to the reader sufficiently enigmatieal. Still I have already given some intimations touehing the solution of the riddle, and others will follow. True it is, that a little art and a great deal of enthusiasm lurk in the baekground. But, first of all, the reader will ask in what preeisely the labors consisted, to which a series of journeys, lasting almost five years, over a great portion of Europe, and through portions of Afriea and Asia, were devoted.

Before speaking of my travels, I referred to a new edition of the New Testament, in the same language in whieh it was written by the Apostles. We must now return to it. Soon after the Apostles had eomposed their writings, they were transeribed. Indeed, copy after eopy being made, they were immensely multiplied down to the sixteenth eentury, when the printing-press took the plaee of the pen in the work of transeription. Many eopies, from the very beginning, abounded in blemishes and oversights. Moreover, transeribers permitted themselves, without authority, though with good intent, here and there, to introduee alterations, sometimes in the expression, sometimes in the matter itself. Omissions were indulged in, or, what more eommonly happened, additions were made.

In the sixteenth century, when the first printed editions were undertaken, the eopies were taken from a few manuseripts whieh were at hand. These first printed eopies were spread abroad, and the impression often repeated. Men beeame aeeustomed to regard, with high veneration, the text of these eopies, without knowing whether it tallied preeisely with the written text of the first century. Soon after, however, manuseripts were found in Europe a thousand years old, and an examination of them showed many points of differenee between them and the printed text. And from these, even in the earliest eenturies, the Greek text had been translated into various languages, into the Latin, Syriae, Egyptian, and other languages. Of these translations there existed, likewise, aneient manuseripts, and an examination of these confirmed the position that many variations of the saered text had long been current. The same thing was proved finally by

those eitations of Biblical passages whieh the fathers of the Chureh, from the seeond eentury onward, had incorporated into their works. In a word, it became in all these ways perfeetly evident that the text of the Apostles, having been for five hundred years reprodueed in manuseripts, whether in Greek, Latin, or any other language, had undergone manifold ehanges whieh left it doubtful what, in any given passage, the Apostle himself had written.

Now, it may be remarked, that learned men have for a long time employed themselves in the task of purging the eommon text of this foreign element, until, more reeently, the idea has been eonceived that the end would be more eertainly attained by setting aside altogether the ordinary text, and substituting in its place a new one derived directly from the oldest and best sourees. This last named idea is, without doubt, the correet one. In this way, and in this alone, is it possible to reform the text, and the eriticism of the text; that is, to earry baek our text, as nearly as possible, to that of the Apostles, and to regulate and clarify the judgment of seholars upon what, in any given plaee, has been actually printed or written. But to make this reform fundamental and thorough, it is absolutely essential that the basis should be assured, that is, that it should be most carefully and eritieally examined. That this had never yet been done, though so many able and eminent men, among whom may be named Erasmus, Robert Stephens, Thedore Beza, Mill, Wetstein, Bengel, Griesbach, Matthäi, and Scholz, have, for eenturies, labored upon it, I became eonvineed in 1840, during the preparation of my first edition of the New Testament. From this eonviction sprang the enterprise which rendered my journeys neeessary. It was my purpose in them, to subject the oldest Greek manuscripts found in the libraries of Europe, to a new and exhaustive exploration. In this undertaking, it appeared to me expedient to publish the most important of these documents separately, and with the utmost care, that they might become the common property of the Chureh, and also for their preservation, should any of the originals ehance to be destroyed.

In conneetion with the Greek, the most aneient Latin manuscripts, also, on aeeount of their speeial value, were made the objects of my researeh es. Very soon, also, I extended these documentary labors to the Greek text of the Old Testament,

which was used even by the Apostles, for the most part, instead of the Hebrew, but which, notwithstanding the high importance to the Church which this circumstance gives it, in the lapse of two thousand years has undergone perplexing changes, even beyond that of the New Testament. The Apocrypha of the New Testament, so called, constituted another department of my researches; writings in regard to which the reader, in the progress of the present essay, will receive more particular information. They stand in manifold relations to the canonical books of the New Testament, and throw important light upon Christian antiquity. Many works of this discription had remained unnoticed in the libraries, and scarcely one of those already known had received an adequate degree of attention. Finally, from all the manuscripts written before about the year 1000, and still extant, including those which do not relate to the Bible, I wished to produce a work, from which it might be better understood than has heretofore been possible, how the ancient manuscripts of different dates and centuries were written, and from which, likewise, one might learn, what very few of scholars even understand, why this manuscript must have been written in the fourth century, that in the fifth, and a third in the eighth, even when containing no notation of the year.

The reader has thus, in a general way, been put in possession of the points aimed at in the researches to which my travels were devoted. It is not impossible they may at first appear too abstruse, but it will be found that taking their rise in an erudite background, they emerge into the realm of practical life. The two chief purposes of these labors, the illustration of the history through which the sacred text has passed, and the restoration of the true and genuine text of the Apostles, on which our faith, our Christianity so much depends, is it possible that these can be matters of indifference to any reader? Has not all Christendom an interest in them? That such is the fact, my own personal experience has proved in the extraordinary sympathy which has been accorded me, in the various countries of the Christian world.

But one aim, standing in close connection with the studies to which I have referred, and indeed presiding over them, has not yet been mentioned. It forms the motive which took me over the Mediterranean, to Africa and Asia. Our European libraries

procured the treasures of which I was in search, for the most part, from the convents of the East, in which, by the hands of industrious monks from the early centuries of the Christian Era, the sacred writings as well as others had been transcribed, and had been collected from all quarters. Might there not now lie in the nooks of these convents, Greek, Coptic, Syrian, Armenian, one or another of these manuscripts, concealed? Would not every leaf of parchment, which might be found existing in them, and bringing testimony from the fifth, sixth, and seventh centuries, be a little treasure—an appreciable enrichment of Christian science?

Such were the questions which I proposed to myself, and for this reason, from the close of the year 1842, I turned my eyes wistfully toward the Orient. At that time I had finished a work which obtained a most marked recognition throughout Europe. A Prussian Theological Faculty bestowed upon the author, then twenty-seven years of age, an honorary Doctorate of Theology, anticipating another from Switzerland, the purpose to bestow which had been communicated to me. Beyond the limits of Germany, three governments conferred the dignity of their orders; several others honored the author with large golden medals, in recognition of scientific service, and one, that of Holland, at the instance of her learned theologians, caused a medal to be struck especially for this service. The reader will doubtless be curious to know what this service was.

There was in Paris one of the three most important manuscripts of the Greek New Testament at that time known to exist. Written in the fifth century, and revised, with many additions, in the seventh and ninth, it had been washed off in the twelfth century, in order that upon the parchment, an article at that time scarce and costly, thus purified and newly calendered, the works of an old Church father, of the name of Ephraim, might be transcribed. Traces of the ancient defaced writing were first observed in the seventeenth century. In the eighteenth, the Swiss theologian, Wetstein, had made an attempt to read it. But at the close of this century, the Parisian librarian informed the theologian, Griesbach, of Jena, that it was impossible for the eye of a mortal to decipher, with any degree of exactness, a writing which six centuries before had been so thoroughly destroyed. In the year 1834, the French government attempted, by chemical means, to restore the legibility of the

faded letters. But a theologian of Leipsic, who was at that time in Paris, proved so unsuccessful in his attempts to read it, that he publicly declared an edition of the text, even with the means employed by the French Government, in the present condition of the manuscript, to be impracticable. Nevertheless, in the years 1841 and 1842, a success so complete attended my effort to decipher this primitive document, that I was able to discriminate perfectly the different hands which had taken part in the work. This success naturally excited, in the circumstances, general astonishment and recognition.

With this result, and the distinction which grew out of it, my courage rose. I now looked upon it as my duty, by the consecration to it of all my powers, to endeavor to attain an object which, from another point of view, had been regarded as chimerical. Moreover, the government of my little Saxon fatherland did not leave me in embarrassment. King Frederic Augustus II, and his illustrious brother, John, a man highly accomplished in his knowledge of the sacred writings, accorded to the young Saxon their personal favor. In addition, many patrons of science in Frankfort, in Geneva, in Rome, in Breslau, offered noble-hearted aid in the attainment of my object.

But I must carry my readers into no further details touching these travels, although many interesting circumstances in this connection might be mentioned; as, for example, the interest expressed in my undertaking by the Pope, Gregory XVI, in a long audience given me in May, 1843, as well as my intercourse with that distinguished philologist, Cardinal Mezzofante, who even honored me with some verses in Greek. Let us rather pass directly to the journey to the East, undertaken in the year 1844. as already mentioned, it was in April, 1844, that I embarked at Leghorn for Egypt. My hope touching the discovery of precious remains of manuscripts, especially of Biblical manuscripts of high Christian antiquity, was even in this journey, beyond expectation, realized. The pearl among them was found at Sinai. In May, 1844, at the convent of St. Catherine, at the foot of Sinai, as I was exploring the library, a huge, wide basket was observed standing in the middle of it, containing a quantity of ancient parchments. The librarian, an intelligent man, informed me that two basketsful of similar remains had been committed to the flames. How great was my astonishment at finding in this

third filling of the fateful basket a considerable number of the leaves of a Greek Bible of the Old Testament, which instantly made upon me the impression of being one of the most ancient which I had ever seen! I had the great satisfaction of securing, without any considerable cost or trouble, about one-third part, in all forty-three leaves; notwithstanding the entire contents of the basket had come so near taking a departure for the fire. I did not, however, succeed in securing the remaining leaves. To the perfect unconsciousness touching my aim, I had neglected to oppose the reticence necessary for its attainment. Transcribing an entire page from the text of Isaiah and Jeremiah, I earnestly recommended the most careful preservation of all the remainder, and of every thing similar which might be discovered.

On my return to Saxony, there was no want of scholars who seemed to comprehend how great a prize I had brought with me. The place in which it had been found, however, I held as a secret, regarding the purposed discovery of the remaining portions as rendering this a duty. My entire rich collection of manuscripts from the East I made over to the Saxon Government, in order to cover the expenditures of necessary future travel. This, however, had been preceded by the statement that, from motives of gratitude, I regarded the government as joint owner with myself. Whilst about fifty manuscripts, some of them very rare and important, retained my own name when they were deposited in the library of the University of Leipsic, I named the Sinaitic Fragments after King Frederic Augustus, and having caused a lithographic impression to be made with the utmost exactness of every letter and mark, I published it in a handsome edition, at Leipsic, in 1846.

In the midst of the labors at home, which stood connected with my foreign researches, I did not permit the distant treasure to escape from my thoughts. Through an influential friend, whom I had secured at the court of the Viceroy of Egypt, I prosecuted the effort to obtain it. He wrote me, however, as the result of the effort, that the monks of the convent, since my departure, had become well aware that they possessed a treasure, and that no sum could tempt them to alienate it.

Then, at length, I resolved upon a new journey to the East, with a view of transcribing the convent manuscript, an original so important for the sacred text. In January of the year 1853,

I left Leipsic, and embarked at Trieste for Egypt. In February I found myself, for the second time, in the convent at Sinai. In this second Oriental journey I was, if possible, still more fortunate than in the first, in the discovery of valuable Scriptural documents; but of that treasure of the year 1844 I obtained no intelligence, nor could I fall upon any trace of it. Yes, a single trace certainly; for in another manuscript I found a little fragment containing eleven short lines on each side, from the book of Genesis. It furnished apparent proof that the manuscript had originally contained the entire Old Testament, but that it must long since have perished.

After my return home, I commenced the publication of a new collection of Christian documents of the highest antiquity, and in the first volume, issued in 1854, I directed attention to the page of the manuscript left behind at Sinai, which I had transcribed in 1844, without, however, even now indicating the place in which it was discovered. I gave public notice, however, that I must claim for myself the honor of the discovery, as touching the remaining fragments of that ancient Scriptural document, from whatever quarter they might at a later day make their appearance. This was occasioned by the conjecture that, through some one of the learned travelers who had visited Sinai after myself, they had found their way to Europe.

I had now to proceed to the preparation of the rich stores in my possession. To a second journey to Paris, undertaken as early as 1849, I now added new travels through Germany, Switzerland, and England, and I was also obliged to devote several years of most diligent labor to a seventh edition of my Greek New Testament, which had in the mean time become necessary. Nevertheless, I felt a constant heart-pressure toward new Oriental researches. On various accounts, but especially because I knew that the name of the Czar of Russia was held in the highest esteem in the Oriental convents, I presented myself, in the autumn of 1856, to the Imperial Russian Government, with the plan of an extensive Oriental journey of research. Objections were not wanting in St. Petersburg to a foreign Protestant scholar who desired to be intrusted with a mission to the East, from an emperor of the Greek orthodox faith. But the good cause prevailed. The sympathy which my proposal secured, even in the Imperial household, exerted a decisive influence upon

the Czar. In September, 1858, my proposal was accepted, and the funds which I had solicited were placed at my disposal. Three months later, after three years of labor, I had happily finished the seventh edition of my New Testament, and in the beginning of January, 1859, I departed for the third time to the East.

Just before this, an incident occurred which afforded me special satisfaction. An English scholar, with whom I was on friendly terms, had been sent by the English Government to the East, for the like purpose of discovering and procuring ancient Greek manuscripts. Notwithstanding all the gold at his disposal, he had been able to obtain almost nothing, as he represented in his report to the royal government of Great Britain. In this report, however, it is remarked that he did not go to Sinai; "for," to quote literally his words, "after the visit of so eminent a paleographer and critic as Dr. Tischendorf," no success was to be hoped for. It was clear from this, that I had done well in keeping my own counsel touching the secret of 1844.

In the last days of January, for the third time in the course of fifteen years, I greeted the convent of St. Catherine. In honor of the mission with which I was intrusted, I was received with marks of special consideration. The prior greeted me with the wish that I might succeed in discovering new supports for the Divine truth. In this he uttered more than he himself was probably aware of.

Having spent several days among the manuscripts of the convent, and having been fortunate enough to discover considerable valuable matter, on the 4th of February I ordered the camels to be in readiness for my departure to Cairo on the 7th. At noon of the above-named day, I made an excursion, in company with the steward of the convent, to the neighboring mountain, and, as we were returning to the convent at nightfall, he invited me to take some refreshment in his cell. We had hardly entered, when, alluding to our previous conversation, he said: "I also have here a Septuagint," (*i. e.*, a copy of the Greek Old Testament translated by the Seventy.) He went to a corner of the room and brought a parcel wrapped in a red cloth, and laid it before me on the table. I opened the cloth, and to my extreme astonishment beheld before me the Sinai Bible. It consisted not merely of the fragments of the Old Testament which I had taken

from the basket fifteen years before, but also of other Old Testament fragments, and especially the entire New Testament, as well as the complete Epistle of Barnabas, and a portion of the Shepherd of Hermas. (These additional constituents of the parcel had been discovered soon after my departure in 1844. Their connection with the fragments which I had so urgently commended to notice had been recognized, and all had been placed together.) In the most joyful excitement, which, of course, neither the steward nor any of the brethren present comprehended, I begged permission to take the cloth with its entire contents to my room. There first I gave myself up to the impression produced by the event. I knew that I held in my hand the most precious jewel which, for the investigation of the Bible, could be found; a manuscript which exceeded all others in the world, with which I had busied myself for twenty years, in antiquity and value. To the emotions of such an hour no description can do justice. The night was cold, yet I sat down immediately to the work of transcribing the Epistle of Barnabas. Of this document, which ascends so nearly to the origin of the Christian Church, the first part, in the Greek text of the original, had been sought in vain since the second century. And the Epistle of Barnabas, as well as the Shepherd of Hermas, from the end of the second to the beginning of the fourth century, had been regarded by many as a component part of the New Testament. For this reason both were included in the Sinai Bible, which had been written in the first half of the fourth century, or about the time of the first Christian emperor.

Very early on the 5th of February, I summoned the steward, and asked permission to take the manuscripts with me to Cairo, for the purpose of a full transcription. As, however, the prior had departed for Cairo two days before, in order to accompany the authorities of the mother convent in that city to Constantinople, for the choice of a new archbishop, and, as one of the brethren raised objections to my request, I departed hastily on the morning of the 7th, desiring, if possible, to meet the authorities there, and to come to an understanding with them. My third departure from the convent was honored by a formal and stately adieu. The Russian flag waved from the walls, and a discharge of firearms awakened the echoes of the mountain. The

most prominent among the brotherhood escorted me to the borders of the neighboring plain.

The same sympathy which had so highly favored me among the Sinaitic brotherhood was repeated in Cairo. The priors, who fortunately had been detained there, after a short deliberation, granted my request, and sent an express messenger by dromedary, to bring it from Sinai. As early as the 24th of February that invaluable prize was placed in my hands for transcription.

The labor was prodigious; for it contained more than one hundred and ten thousand lines, with countless passages obscured by later corrections, and many also faded, which had to be transcribed under a most painful scrutiny. Moreover, the temperature at Cairo, in the months of March, April, and May, never fell below some twenty degrees, Reaumer, in the shade.

A continued intercourse with the convent gave me opportunity to suggest to the brethren the idea of presenting the original Scripture manuscript to the Czar of Russia, as the shield and protector of the Greek orthodox faith. The thought met with favor; yet the actual realization of it found an unexpected obstacle. The new archbishop, who had been unanimously chosen on Easter-week, and with whom rested the final decision touching this presentation, still lacked consecration by an ecclesiastical superior, and a recognition by the Sublime Porte. At this point, the Patriarch of Jerusalem interposed a protest against his person. However, the hope was entertained that his official installment would be reached in the course of three months. In this state of affairs, I departed for Jerusalem in the beginning of May.

In Jaffa, I fell in with the Grand Duke Constantine, of Russia, who, from the outset, had manifested the liveliest interest in my mission, and accompanied him to Jerusalem. After having here consulted, in furtherance of my object, the old libraries of Jerusalem and of the convent of St. Saba, on the Dead Sea, I proceeded to Beirut and Ladakia, and thence to Smyrna and the Isle of Patmos. In these travels, also, my researches had met with excellent success; but at the appointed time, at the end of July, I hastened back to Cairo. There a most unexpected disappointment awaited me. The Sinaitic brotherhood were far from having obtained their wish. The Patriarch of Jerusalem had reaffirmed his protest in the most peremptory manner. The five

deputies of the convent had been sitting for months, helpless, at Constantinople, their well-established rights finding no audience at the Porte, whilst thus opposed by the authority of the hostile patriarch.

The archbishop and his friends now solicited my interposition in behalf of their imperiled privileges. Without hesitation, I decided to proceed, in the character of an advocate to Constantinople in support of their deputies. Received most courteously by Prince Lobanow, the Russian Embassador at the Sublime Porte, and lodged in his own country-seat on the shores of the Bosphorus, it was in my power to be serviceable to the cause intrusted to me. Still the implacable and powerful opponent maintained his ascendency. At last, it appeared that the object was to be accomplished only by the personal appearance of the archbishop, and by an appeal on his part to an assembly of the patriarchs, archbishops, and bishops; and, in fact, before the expiration of the year, in consequence of this counsel, the just cause of the convent prevailed. Bearing this counsel to Cairo, I connected with it a proposition, supported by Prince Lobanow, looking to the attainment of my own object.

On the 27th of September, I arrived again in Cairo. From the assembled brotherhood and their archbishop, I received an expression of most hearty thanks for the zeal with which I had prosecuted their cause at Constantinople; and on the 28th of September, with demonstrations of the highest respect and confidence, they placed in my hands the Sinai Bible for transmission to Petersburg. In the present condition of the convent, this could be only a provisional and not a definitive conveyance. The possession of the manuscript was primarily accorded to myself, but only for the object, by a constant inspection of the original, to prepare an exact edition of it for publication.

In the early days of October, whilst yet the palm-groves were basking in the glowing heat of the South, I left the land of the Nile, and on the 19th of November, when the northern winter was already settling upon St. Petersburg, I presented my rich collection of ancient manuscripts, in the Greek, Syriac, Coptic, Arabic, and other languages, to the Imperial Majesty of Russia, at Zarsko Selo. The cynosure and crown of the collection was the Sinai Bible.

Tempting invitations to settle in St. Petersburg permanently,

or at least for a number of years, I deemed it my duty to decline. On the contrary, it was at Leipsic, that in the course of three years, making in the mean time a triple journey to St. Petersburg, I finished this difficult undertaking by the publication of the work in four volumes, folio.

In October, 1862, I went to St. Petersburg, in order to make presentation of it. The gracious Emperor, who had liberally borne the expense, and also granted my request, that a work so important for Christendom might make its appearance in connection with the millenary festival of the Russian monarchy, distributed the major part of the copies to the Christian Church at large. The deepest gratitude for this act has manifested itself in the collective Christian Church, without distinction of creed. The Pope himself, in an autograph letter, expressed to the editor his kind wishes and his admiration. It is only a few months since that the two principal univerities of old England, Cambridge and Oxford, honored the discoverer and editor of the Sinai Bible with the most hearty recognition of his services, bestowing upon him their highest academic dignity.

A venerable man of letters availed himself of this opportunity to remark, that he would rather be the discoverer of the Sinai Bible, than the finder of the Kohinoor of the Queen of England, (the so-called "mountain of light," the great diamond, valued at millions of money.)

But what is far dearer to me than all these flattering tokens of recognition and gratitude, and the pleasure derived from which can not be diminished by the assaults of envy, is the conviction that the Sinai Bible is a gift of Providence, bestowed upon us in this period, so fruitful in the products of an anti-Christian activity, as a clear light in the exploration of the Sacred Scriptures, both to establish their truth and to demonstrate their uncorrupted form.

One of the most important tasks, therefore, now devolving upon me, is the careful translation of the New Testament from the Sinai original into German. This translation will be accompanied with an extended preface, in which I shall endeavor to answer all the questions which the inquisitive reader, with the Bible of Luther in his hands, would be likely to propound as touching the Sacred Text.

WHEN WERE OUR GOSPELS COMPOSED?*

BY DR. CONSTANTIN TISCHENDORF, PROFESSOR IN LEIPSIC.

The question is often asked, how does the case really now stand in regard to the Life of Jesus? No one is ignorant of the fact, that works have recently been composed by men of letters, for the purpose of proving that He whom Christendom calls its Lord did not in fact live such a life as the Scriptures describe. These works have been distributed with the greatest zeal, and have been read by multitudes. Much which they contain may not be understood; but one thing is clear to all, that their purpose is to rob the person of the Savior of his divine character.

Now, is this divine character of the person of Jesus an essential element of Christianity? May we not find the glorious ethical system of Christianity still remaining, even if Christ himself is not the Son of God? He who can believe that, has either no idea at all, or an entirely false idea of Christianity. Christianity does not depend upon the moral system of Jesus, however glorious it may be found to be, but upon his person. The Church is founded upon the person of Christ. That person is its corner-stone. To it the doctrines of Jesus and of his Apostles, in the most explicit terms, bring us directly back. If we are in error in believing in the person, in the sense of the teachings of the Evangelists, then the Church is deceiving itself. It is time to give up the Church.

The connection between the Church and the person of Jesus is so intimate, that the discussion concerning the person of Jesus touches the existence or non-existence of the Church itself. That this is the fact, is deeply felt by the Christian community. The existence of this conviction is attested by the earnestness with which light is sought in regard to the life of Jesus, through which the truth in regard to his person may be reached.

Every reader knows that our Gospels are made up of descriptions of the life of Jesus; indeed, upon these Gospels the life of

---

* Translated by Rev. HENRY SMITH, D. D., Professor in Lane Theological Seminary.

Jesus directly depends; for as to our other knowledge of him, derived from a high Christian antiquity, it in part depends upon the Gospels themselves, in part it is limited to trifling supplements, and in part it proceeds from a hostile opposition to him. Hence, it has come to pass, that those who have assailed the life of Jesus, his miraculous works, and the divine character of his person, have directed their attacks against the truth and credibility of the Gospels.

But how was it possible to assail the truth and credibility of the Gospels—those books which were written by Matthew and John, two immediate disciples of the Lord; by Mark and Luke, two trusted assistants and companions of the Apostles?

The answer is, it became possible, by denying that our Gospels were composed by the men whose names they bear on their face. Does any one ask, why so great importance attaches to this circumstance? Because the declarations of immediate eye-witnesses, as Matthew and John, and of men who stood in a most intimate relation to eye-witnesses, as Mark and Luke, put forth an extraordinary claim to credibility and trustworthiness. This claim is narrowed down and frittered away in proportion to the lateness of time after the events in which the writings were composed; in proportion to the distance of the narrators from the facts narrated, so that they could have related only what they had heard or read from other reporters, who themselves, perhaps, were not trustworthy. To such authors, men who were in no position to give proper testimony, who composed their reports long after the time of Jesus, from existing traditions and rumors, the attempt is made to ascribe our Gospels, by severing them from the Evangelists whose names they bear.

Manifestly, this is a sure way to annihilate the high value and authority of the Gospels. It is true, indeed, that there exists another still more convenient way, and this method also has been adopted. Some very wise heads, namely, long ago entertained the idea that the sound human understanding is superior to what is called divine revelation. What is said in these writings about miracles must be derived from the imperfect ideas of that period, from a prejudiced apprehension of the meaning of the Old Testament, in a word, from the accommodation, so-called, through which Jesus adapted his discourses and actions to the Jewish ex-

peetation, in his period, and by which he gave himself out to be more than he really was.

This glorifieation of the sound human understanding, whieh, we may easily see, presents a very attractive aspect to the world, has by little and little grown up into modern infidelity. Modern infidelity consists in severing the human spirit from God and Christianity, and in it, hollow phrases about freedom, and the dignity of man, have rendered a eapital service. According to it, man was not born in sin, and standing in need of a redemption, but as a free being, who is to be eductated for every thing good and beautiful, and who is thus to enjoy a dignified life. That it makes quiek work with the Gospels, and with the entire Scriptures; that it despises them as the product of an antiquated point of view which humanity has left behind; that without more ado it strips them off as uneomfortable fetters imposed by a sensuous age, all this will be readily understood.

One of the issues of this modern infidelity is that Parisian abortion of the year 1863, which has made so much noise in the world, the Life of Jesus by Renan. This work has absolutely nothing in eommon with an honorable investigation. With a perfeetly arbitrary eapriee, having no foundation whatever, it eonverts history into conjeeture. What sort of historieal investigation do my readers imagine it to be, when Renan, for example, represents John as having written his Gospel from motives of wounded self-love, full of envy in respeet to Peter, full of hatred against Judas? What sort of historieal investigation is it, whieh represents that the sympathy of the wife of Pilate with Jesus may have arisen from having notieed from a window in the palaee, which looked upon the eourt of the temple, the "gentle Galilean," the "beautiful young man," and that now, under the thought that his blood is about to be shed, she was oppressed with a noeturnal night-mare?—when he aseribes the resurrection of Lazarus to a deception, whieh escaped the notiee of Jesus himself, practieed by Lazarus and his sisters rendered irresponsible by fanatieism; the siek man, namely, permitting himself in grave clothes to be conveyed to the family sepulcher, and coming forth from the vault during the almost epileptie excitement of Jesus, who believed in the reality of the death?—when he throws light upon the eonfliet in Gethsemane by language like this; that his thoughts,

perchanee, were reverting to the elear fountains of Galilee, where he might have refreshed himself; to the vine and fig-tree, in whose shadow he might have rested; to the young maidens, who might have reeiproeated his love?

These few specimens will satisfy the reader. He will be able from them to make up a judgment upon Renan's book. That, in spite of its utter untenableness, its reekless disfiguration of the facts of history, it should have found an extraordinary circulation in Germany itself, proves only to what a lamentable extent, in the laek of an intelligent understanding of Biblical history, the taste of an age, fallen into unbelief, prevails even among us.

But in the case of this book, a speeial reproaeh falls upon German seienee itself. As the view of the Bible already spoken of, the view, namely, which ereets the unassisted reason above revelation, and whieh is the growth of German soil, is the starting-point of the whole book, so German men of letters are to supply, it seems, the scientific basis whieh it laeks.

This brings us baek to the attaeks upon the genuineness—the apostolie origin—of the Gospels. In this relation the shallowness of the Freneh work is obvious. The thinking, reasoning German demands, if he is to surrender the Divine authority of the Gospels, that it shall be demonstrated to him, that they were not in faet eomposed by the men to whom the Chureh ascribes them.

In order to understand the merits of the question, the line of proof of whieh the opponents of the Gospels avail themselves must be elosely scrutinized. In this proeess of proof, greater stress is laid upon no point than upon this: that from the history of the seeond eentury, it is apparent that the Gospels did not make their appearanee until after the expiration of the apostolie period. In support of this position, an appeal is made to the earliest literature of the Church. It is affirmed that in the Christian writings, which were composed immediately after the apostolie age, the traees of a knowledge of our Gospels, and of a reference to them, are wanting, particularly in the ease of the Gospel of John; and the eonclusion is hence drawn, that they were not at that time in existence.

If this can be established; if there exists in the Church such a literature, that is, a series of works, whieh were eomposed from about the end of the first century to the year fifty of the second century, and we look into them in vain for traces of the existence

of our Gospels, the case indeed becomes a critical one for the affirmation and belief of the Church, that these same Gospels were composed as early as the second half of the first century by the holy men whose names they bear. Before examining the fact, there is but one objection which we could raise against such a process of proof. We could simply raise the question, whether the literature referred to is of such a character, or of such an extent, as to justify us in deriving so important an inference, from its silence touching the Gospels, its failure in making citations from them. One might write very much that is excellent, without being obliged on that account expressly to recognize our Gospels, and to make citations from them. But the case certainly would have a far higher significance, if the very opposite should be made to appear; if, namely, our Gospels should be forced to be recognized in works written soon after the apostolic age; if, perchance, they should be found to have been treated with great respect, and even thus early distinguished as canonical sacred writings. In this case, clearly, we should regard it as a point made out, that our Gospels were actually written in the apostolic age itself, however strenuously their opponents might assail or deny it.

The author of this article, in common with many candid scholars, entertains the conviction, that a conscientious investigation of the subject proves a position directly opposite to that which the opposers of the Gospels, particularly of the Gospel of John, the most important and decisive of the whole four, believe themselves able to establish.

It will serve to throw a welcome light upon this deeply interesting problem, if we attempt to present the proof itself; if, with our best powers, we investigate the question, whether the earliest Christian literature renders its verdict *for* or *against* our Gospels.

Let us begin, then, by transporting ourselves, in imagination, to the latter part of the second century, and let us look around to note appearances in Christendom, as touching our Gospels. We observe, then, that at this period, in all parts of the Church, our Gospels were regarded as Holy Scripture. At that time there were writings which had been composed in different countries, and by the most distinguished teachers in the Church, in manifold passages of which our Gospels are referred to, and

treated as apostolic sacred books. In *Lyons*, where the first Christian Church of Gaul was established, the bishop, *Irenæus*, at this period composed a great work upon the earliest, to-wit, the Gnostic, heresies; that is, philosophical systems arbitrarily changing the doctrines of the Church. In this work he availed himself throughout of our Gospels, in his contest against these philosophical errors. The number of passages in which this is done amounts to about four hundred. The passages with citations from John alone amount to more than eighty.

The career of the ardent and learned *Tertullian*, in the last ten years of the second century and onward, at *Carthage*, in proconsular Africa, exhibits a similar state of facts. In his numerous works, we find many hundred passages of our Gospels cited as decisive proof-texts; from the Gospel of John alone, over two hundred. The same holds true in a still higher degree of *Clement*, the famous teacher of the Catechumen school of *Alexandria*, in Egypt, about the end of the second century. Here, too, we may place a document, commonly called by the name of its discoverer, *Muratori*, a catalogue, namely, of the books of the New Testament, which in the earliest time were regarded as canonical and sacred. This catalogue was written soon after the time of the Roman bishop Pius, (A. D. 142–157), consequently, about A. D. 170, and in all probability at *Rome*.* In this catalogue, at the head of the books of the New Testament, which at that time were regarded in the Church as canonical, stand our four Gospels. It is true, indeed, that the first lines of this manuscript, which relate to Matthew and Mark, have perished; but in the still existing conclusion upon Mark, the Gospel of Luke is designated as the third, and that of John as the fourth, so that, even at this early period, the order of arrangement of the several Gospels is proved to have become universally customary.

In this connection we will produce two other witnesses, although one of them reaches back to a still higher antiquity; we mean the two oldest translations of the Greek text of the New Testament, which originated with the Apostles. The one is the *Syriac*, and bears the name of the *Peshito;* the other is the *Latin version*,

* This designation of the time is determined by the fact that the author of the catalogue thus writes: "The Shepherd" was written *very lately, in our time*, by Hermas, in the city of Rome, whilst Pius, his brother, occupied the Episcopal Chair.

known by the name of the *Itala*, both of which give to our four Gospels the first place. The canonical authority of these four Gospels must have been fully established in the mother Church, when they were thus translated into the vernacular languages of the newly converted communities of the Latin and Syrian Christians. Now, at what time did this take place? The Syriac translation, which carries us to Asia, to the vicinity of the Euphrates, is almost universally referred to the end of the second century; and good reasons may be assigned for this judgment, even though a demonstrative proof is wanting. The Latin version, on the other hand, before the end of the second century, had already acquired a degree of public authority; for the Latin translator of the great Greek work of Irenæus "against the heretics," who is to be placed at about the close of the second century (and this translator is followed by Tertullian in his citations from Irenæus), as well as Tertullian himself, at the close of the same century, follow the text of the Itala. This authority of the Latin translation of the Gospels, at the end of the second century, necessarily presupposes that at that time it had an age of several decades of years. How important a fact in determining the antiquity of our Gospels this is; that already in the second half of the second century, and that, too, in their determinate number of four, they had received a common translation into Latin, as well as into Syriac, will appear more clearly in the sequel.

For the present, we will linger a little with the two first of the great Church teachers above named, Irenæus and Tertullian. Their testimony touching our four Gospels is absolute, and has been drawn into doubt by no one, not even by the opposers of the Gospel of John. But there remains the question whether this testimony can be limited to their own time; that is, whether it proves nothing more than that the Gospels were current at their period. Not only does *Irenæus* employ the Gospels with all confidence and emphasis against the heretics, he gives utterance to the sentiment that there exist, of necessity, *four* Gospels, precisely four, neither more nor less. He compares this case with the four quarters of the globe, the four principal winds, the four faces of the cherubim. He says the four Gospels are the four pillars of the Church spread over the earth's surface, and he recognizes in their quadruplicity a special decree of the Creator. Is a view like this reconcilable with the idea, that the four Gos-

pels began to acquire their authority in the time of Irenæus himself?—that to the three elder, a later fourth was at that time striving to attach itself? Are we not rather compelled to suppose that even at that time their authority was an authority derived from antiquity, that it was perfectly established, and that even their quadruplicity presented itself as a thing long since and firmly settled, so that it occurred to the bishop of Lyons to speak of and illustrate the four-fold number of the Gospels in the ingenious manner referred to above? Irenæus died in the second year after the expiration of the second century, but in his youth he had sat at the feet of the aged and highly-venerated Polycarp, who in his time had been a disciple of the evangelist John; and he had, moreover, been acquainted with other eye-witnesses of the Gospel history. In relating this fact, Irenæus, with deep emotion, at the same time mentions Polycarp's communications to him of what he had heard from the mouth of John and the other disciples of Jesus, adding expressly, that the whole agreed with the Scripture. But let us hear him for ourselves. In his letter to Florinus,* he thus writes: "I saw thee when I was yet young, with Polycarp, in Asia Minor; when thou wast living in the splendor of the Imperial Court, and wast at pains to secure his approbation. For what happened at that period I remember better than what has recently occurred. That which we receive in youth grows with ourselves, and clings to us firmly. And so I am able now to tell where the blessed Polycarp sat in his addresses, how he came in and went out, how he lived and how he looked; what discourses he held to the people; how he spoke of his intimate intercourse with John and with others who had seen the Lord, and quoted their own discourses; how he rehearsed what he had heard from those, who with their own eyes had seen the Light of the World, in full agreement with the Scripture."

Such, then, is the language of Irenæus himself touching his intercourse with Polycarp, and the communications of Polycarp. Who can, who dares nevertheless suspect that Irenæus heard no word from Polycarp in regard to the Gospel of John? The time of the intercourse of the young Irenæus with the aged Polycarp,

---

*See Euseb. Hist. Eccl. V, 20. (Iren. opp. ed. Stieren, I, 822. Also, Iren. adv. Haeres. III, 3, 4.

who suffered martyrdom at Smyrna about the year 165, can certainly not be put later than about the year 150.

At this time, then, are we to believe that Irenæus heard from his teacher, in whose communications concerning John he expressly glories, nothing in regard to the Gospel of John? It must be granted that a testimony for the Gospel of John, on the part of Polycarp, carries us directly back to John himself. For if Polycarp did speak to Irenæus of the Gospel of John, as a work of his teacher, he must have learned from John's own mouth that he was the author of that Gospel. No more stunning blow, therefore, can fall upon the head of the opposers of the genuineness of the Gospel of John, than the testimony of Polycarp in its favor. But this blow is inevitable, for to dispute this testimony is possible only to an absurd skepticism. The case becomes the more decisive, the more carefully we examine the contradictory proposition. For the opponents of the Gospel of John maintained that it made its first appearance about the year 150, and that Polycarp never spoke of it to Irenæus. But now, in this case, is it conceivable that Irenæus should have believed the work to be genuine, a work which appeared as the most sublime legacy of John to the Christian world, as the report of an intimate eye-witness of the life of the Redeemer, as a Gospel which, with an air of independence, took its position over against the three other Gospels, and put their authority in peril? Would it not have been convicted, in the eyes of Irenæus, of the grossest deception by the single circumstance that Polycarp had never mentioned it? And yet are we to believe that Irenæus employs this work as a sacred and safe weapon in his conflict with heretics, with men who dealt in corrupt Scriptures and apocryphal writings? Are we, moreover, to believe that, without any ado, he bound it up in that close, indissoluble bond with the other three Gospels?

What we here employ as an argument is nothing new; it stands, at any rate, in the writings of Irenæus, and has often been read in them; read, however, it must be admitted, without sufficient consideration, or it could not have been so lightly esteemed. We, on our part, can find only its proper force given to the argument, when sober-minded men—men who give the highest weight to historical authority—prefer to regard the testimony of Irenæus, propped by Polycarp, in behalf of the Gospel of John,

as outweighing all the scruples and counter-proofs of skeptical men of letters.

The case is similar with *Tertullian* and his testimony in behalf of our Gospels. This man, who, from a heathen, worldly advocate, became a powerful defender of Christian truth, is so exact in investigating the origin and relative value of the four Gospels that he ascribes only a subordinate rank to Mark and Luke as apostolic men; that is, as companions and assistants of the apostles, in comparison with John and Matthew, to whom, as real apostles—as men who were personally chosen by the Lord—the full apostolic authority is attributed. (See adv. Marcion, iv. 2.) Moreover he presents an irrefragable principle by which the truth of the several parts of the Christian canon and (a point on which he insists most earnestly) the genuineness of the apostolic writings are to be tested. He shows and demands that a testimony which now passes for truth should bear this test; that it was regarded as truth in former days; that from this previous authority we are to ascend to the Apostles themselves; but that apostolic genuineness is to be measured by the testimony of the Apostolic Churches, the Churches which were founded by the Apostles in person. (See adv. Marcion, iv, 5.) Is it at all credible that this acute man should have fallen into an uncritical carelessness just at this point; his reception, namely, and defense of the genuineness of the four Gospels? The passages just referred to are in his famous work against Marcion, who, following the bent of his heretical humor, had arbitrarily tampered with the Evangelical text. Of the four Gospels he had entirely suppressed three, and in the fourth, Luke, he had made such changes as suited him. Now Tertullian, in his work against him, appeals expressly to the testimony of the Apostolic Churches for the four collective Gospels. Is this assurance in the mouth of a man like Tertullian to pass for nothing? At the time when he wrote it, scarcely more than an hundred years had yet passed since the death of John. At that time the testimony of the Apostolic Church of Ephesus, to which he appeals—a Church in which John had long labored, and in whose bosom he died—was, in fact, perfectly decisive, as touching the genuineness or the spuriousness of the Gospel of John: and the task of ascertaining the judgment and testimony of this Church was perfectly easy. In this connection, it is a point not to be overlooked that

we have not here to do with a mere man of letters, dealing in learned observations, but with a man with whom this was a question of deep and holy solemnity touching his faith; yea, touching the salvation of his soul. The foundation scriptures of Christianity, claiming for themselves an apostolic origin, books which even at that time awoke the universal opposition of that worldly wisdom, from whose school Tertullian himself had proceeded, is it possible to believe that he would have accepted these books with an unscrupulous credulity? But now, since he, in addition, expressly assures us that in his decisive defense of the apostolic origin of all four of the Gospels, he goes back to the warrant of the Apostolic Churches, it would plainly fall into the category of contemptible quibbling, to pretend to cherish doubts touching his conscientious investigation of the apostolic origin of the Gospels.

We affirm, then, that the authentication of the four Gospels by Irenæus and Tertullian can not be confined to their own times, but their testimony must be regarded as representing the very earliest testimonies which were placed within their reach. And that we are entirely justified in this is demonstrated not only by the still older co-witness already cited, the author, namely, of the catalogue of the New Testament books, discovered by Muratori, and the African Latin translator of the Gospels, the author of the so-called Itala, but also by all the considerations and testimonies derived from periods ante-dating Irenæus and Tertullian.

The reader has doubtless heard of books in which a single whole has been formed out of the four Gospels; they are called Harmonies. In this way an attempt has been made to give a more distinct picture of the life of our Lord. The fuller statement of one Evangelist is employed to supplement another; and particularly by interspacing the narrative of John in the narratives of the three other Gospels, step after step is traced in the facts of the three last years of our Lord's life. Works of this character were undertaken as early as about the year 170, by two men of learning. The name of the one was *Theophilus*, who was bishop of Antioch in Syria; the name of the other, *Tatian*, a pupil of the great theologian and martyr, Justin. It is true, both these works are lost; but of the first, that of Theophilus, Jerome, in the fourth century, has preserved notices, and calls it a compilation of the four Gospels into one whole; and

of the second, in like manner, Eusebius and Theodoret, in the fourth and fifth centuries, have preserved notices. Tatian himself called it, "the Gospel formed from four," (Diatessaron).—Now these two men composed other works which are still extant. In these works are found undoubted citations, not to speak of the others, from the Gospel of John. Their harmonies, however, which have not come down to our time, far surpass the significance of single citations, for the attempt made in them carries us necessarily to a time when the Gospels presented an absolute whole; a time in which their multifarious narratives, which, in many particulars, bore in themselves the appearance of a real diversity, excited the desire and felt necessity of producing from them a higher unity—a harmonious whole. If these two attempts were made soon after the middle of the second century, it must of necessity be presupposed that the use and recognition of all the four Gospels are facts which existed at a far earlier period.

Passing by other testimonies belonging to this period, we have now to mention the letters of *Ignatius* and *Polycarp*, two disciples of the Apostles, which conduct us to a very early point of time, to the beginning of the second century. When the devout servant of God, Ignatius, whom his teacher John had consecrated as bishop of Antioch, after a long and faithful official life, was conveyed to Rome, between the years 107 and 115, to meet a martyr's death, he composed, during the journey, a number of letters, of which a twofold text, a longer and a shorter, have come down to us. For our object, we refer only to the shorter, because this alone is recognized by most scholars as the original. There are to be found in them references to Matthew and to John. Thus, in his letter to the Romans, he writes: "The bread of God will I, the bread of heaven, the bread of life, which is the flesh of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, . . . and the drink of God will I, the blood of the same, which is imperishable love and eternal life." These words exhibit a dependence upon the 6th chapter of John, where we read, "I am the bread which came down from heaven," (verse 41); "I am the bread of life," (verse 48); "And the bread that I will give him is my flesh," (verse 51); "Who so eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life," (verse 54). In the same letter Ignatius writes: "For what is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul," which may be found literally in Matthew xvi, 26. In like

manner, the passage in his letter to the Church of Smyrna, where it is said of Jesus that he was baptized of John, in order that all righteousness might be fulfilled of him, refers to Matthew iii, 15, ("for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness.") In like manner, the short letter of *Polycarp*, written soon after the death of Ignatius, consequently about 115, refers to passages in Matthew, as, for example, where he writes: "We will implore the All-seeing God that he lead us not into temptation, as the Lord hath said, The spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak." (Compare Matt. vi, 13, and xxvi, 41.) We do not presume, however, to attribute to these citations a perfectly decisive weight. They do not exclude, especially those compared with John, all doubt that they were borrowed from our written Gospels; the reference, however, must ever remain highly probable, and they afford a support to the supposition that our Gospels were in use as early as the beginning of the second century. But of one circumstance it is our duty to take special notice. We find, namely, in Polycarp's letter, a certain trace of his use of the first epistle of John. Polycarp writes: "For every one that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is Antichrist." In John iv, 3, it stands: "Every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God, and this is that spirit of Antichrist."

This passage, cited by Polycarp from the epistle of John about the year 115, has especial value for this reason, that this epistle and the Gospel of John, in virtue of their close connection, in contents and expression, must have been the work of one and the same author; the authentication of the epistle, therefore, serves at the same time for that of the Gospel. But a testimony of Polycarp, respecting the writings of John, considering the intimate relation in which he stood to John, as already explained, possesses a value so extraordinary as hardly to admit any further objection against the genuineness of the writings under consideration. For this reason there has been no failure in applying to it that infamous art which would weaken and set aside the fact of the citation. A sharp-sighted man cries out: "There is no need of regarding the words of Polycarp as a quotation from John, for it may have been a sentence which was current in the Church, and which might have been reduced to writing as well

by John as by Polycarp, even if the latter knew nothing of the former.

Even before the author of this conjecture, another person of like proclivities, had fallen upon a different evasion! Why could not the supposition be reversed, making the author of the so-called epistle of John to cite Polycarp? It requires some courage to hurl into the world a senseless whim; yet there are some learned people who are by no means lacking in courage of this character. If, however, as in the present case, it is possible by whims of this description to reach no just conclusions, there is at hand a universal and radical expedient. That expedient has been resorted to here. It is this: Polycarp never wrote the letter. It is true, indeed, that Polycarp's own pupil, Irenæus, believed and affirmed the contrary; but plausible reasons are never wanting for an affirmation like this; and so we may be tossed and jolted even upon the most solid ground. Now who permits the convictions of a thousand years to be shaken by agitations like these? The question is not hard to answer. On this point, the opinion of the reader, I presume, will not be at variance with my own.

We now proceed to one of the most worthy cotemporaries of Polycarp, *Justin Martyr*, who, even before his witness-death at Rome, about A. D. 166, had made him dear to the memory of the Church, had acquired high fame by his writings. Two of these are defenses of Christianity, which he presented to the Roman Emperor, the first in A. D. 138, the second in A. D. 161. It is obviously an important question whether Justin, who composed one of his chief works about A. D. 138, delivers any testimony for the use and authority of our Gospels. As touching the three first Gospels, particularly that of Matthew, in spite of the prevailing skepticism, Justin's employment of them stands firmly and strong. But the denial of the position that he also made use of the Gospel of John, is all the stronger on that account. On our side, however, we must unconditionally maintain this position. The sentence, which is entirely peculiar to John, "And the word was made flesh," reappears unmistakably in several passages in Justin. The answer which, in Justin, the Baptist gives to the interrogating messengers of the Jews, "I am not Christ, but the voice of a preacher," depends absolutely upon John i: 20 and 23. The words of the prophet Zachariah, (xii: 10),

John quotes in a manner nowhere else to be found; since, however, Justin perfectly agrees with him, he must be dependent upon John.

Finally, we find in Justin, in his first work in defense of Christianity, A. D. 138, the following: "Christ has said, Except ye be born again, ye can not enter the kingdom of heaven. But that it is impossible that those who have once been born should enter again into their mother's womb, is clear to every man." On this passage there has been much debate. We ourselves adhere stringently to the view that Justin here refers to John iii: 3, 4, where the declaration of Jesus to Nicodemus thus reads, "Except a man be born again, he can not see the kingdom of God." That this passage of John was floating before the mind of Justin, who often quotes the Old Testament with a certain freedom of expression, is reduced, in my judgment, to a certainty by his own addition to the words of our Lord; for in John, also, the following verse reads, "Nicodemus saith unto him, How can a man be born when he is old? Can he enter the second time into his mother's womb and be born?" But if we are justified in assuming the use of John by Justin, this single fact proves the position that our Gospel of John first made its appearance about the year 150, and is therefore spurious, to be an idle invention.

In still another way we are able to demonstrate that Justin testifies to the prevailing authority of our Gospels in his time. In this connection we will point only to a single fact. He mentions, namely, in the same work above referred to, of the year 138, that every Sunday in the Christian assemblies, "the memoirs of the Apostles," "called Gospels," were read in connection with the writings of the prophets. Here, at the first glance, we have the Gospels placed on an equal footing with the writings of the prophets. Without any doubt, this converts the Gospels into canonical, sacred books; as the others, according to the regulating custom of the Jewish synagogue, had been from the beginning of the Church. Who in all the world now can suppose that, in Justin's time, other Gospels besides our own, in regard to which we know with absolute certainty, that in a few decades of years after Justin they resounded through the whole Christian world, could have been in the sacred use of the Church? Moreover, it contradicts all that we know of the development of the canon of Scripture, to suppose that at the

beginning, and consequently also in Justin's time, merely Matthew, Mark, and Luke were regarded as Holy Scripture, and that John was added only at a later day.

We have thus far been occupied, almost exclusively, with the writings of men, whom the Church, in whose service they had spent their lives, from the second century, honored as venerable pillars of the Faith. At this same period there existed an ample literature, which, like wild sprouts and off-shoots, flourished, side by side, with that of the Church; a literature which erected a proud, foreign wisdom above the simple faith of Christianty—the Heretical literature, or that of the teachers of error. Even from this literature we obtain perfectly satisfactory testimonies to this point, that already about the middle and before the middle of the second century, our Gospels enjoyed the highest authority in the Church. This, on the one hand, is interesting, as making us better acquainted with the character of these earliest heresies, and, on the other, important, as touching the question of the antiquity, and, consequently, the origin of our Gospels. In summoning these teachers of error as witnesses for our Gospels, we have a predecessor no less distinguished than Irenæus, the bishop of Lyons, of whom we have already had occasion often to speak. In Irenæus we find this declaration: "So firmly established, however, are our Gospels, that even the heretics bear witness in their behalf, and that every one of them makes them his point of departure in establishing his own doctrine." (See adv. Hæres. iii, 11; 7.) This, then, is a judgment from the second half of the second century touching the first half. And this first half of the second century is the precise period in which the opposers of the genuineness of our Gospels suppose themselves able to find ground upon which to rest their opposition. Now, let us ask, would not a man like Irenæus, who lived only a few decades of years after the period in question, be likely to have known this better than the professors of the nineteenth century? High as is the respect due to that progress of Science which adorns our century, those men of letters can claim at our hands small respect who employ their knowledge and acuteness in smiting the face of history and of truth. What Irenæus says is capable of being supported, even at this day, by facts, and we shall proceed all the more safely if we accord to him our full confidence. The records of the oldest Church fathers touching the

earliest heretics, (and these records, let it be remarked, we have chiefly to thank for our knowledge of them,) prove most conclusively that they depend upon our Gospels, as upon books held in high and holy estimation in the Church. Irenæus himself is one of the chief authors of these records. To his work must be added one, discovered only about twenty years since, of a pupil of Irenæus, Hippolytus by name, who stood, therefore, near enough to the time in which these heretics flourished, to force a recognition of him, in company with his teacher, as a trustworthy voucher.

One of the most intellectual and bold thinkers among these teachers of error was *Valentin*, who, in the first forty years of the second century, went from Egypt to Rome, and who may have lived twenty years from that time. He undertook to write an entire history of the heavenly emanations, which, in the realm of the divine powers and supernal beings, preceded the mission of the Only-begotten of the Father; as well as to determine more exactly, in connection with these emanations, which his fancy had created, the nature and the operations of the Only-begotten. In this extravagant undertaking, he did not disdain to borrow from the Gospel of John, and to employ for his purpose a multitude of expressions and ideas, as the Word, the Only-begotten, Life, Light, Fullness, Truth, Grace, Redeemer, Comforter. We have here so undeniable a relation between the Gospel of John and the system of Valentin, that only two explanations are possible. Either Valentin used John, or John, Valentin. The latter supposition, after what has thus far been said of the second century, must appear pure nonsense, and a close examination of the subject will confirm this verdict. If, however, a literature hostile to the Church can reconcile itself to it, it condemns itself. But Irenæus declares in plain words that the sect of Valentin availed itself in the fullest manner of the Gospel of John. Very especially does he show, in detail, that it derived one of its chief elements from the first chapter of John. The statement of Irenæus is confirmed and completed by Hippolytus; he cites particular expressions of our Lord, peculiar to John, which Valentin used. The clearest instance of this is John x: 8, for Hippolytus writes: "Because the prophets and the law, according to Valentin's doctrine, were inspired only by a subordinate and foolish spirit, therefore Valentin says, 'Even for this reason

speaks the Redeemer: all who come before me were thieves and robbers.'" (Hippol. in the Philosophumena, vi, 35.) And as the Gospel of John was employed by Valentin, it is susceptible of proof that the same was true of the other Evangelists. According to the statement of Irenæus, he used as a symbolic representative of the above-mentioned subordinate spirit, whom he called the Demiurge, (the architect,) the centurion at Capernaum. (Matt. viii: 9; Luke vii: 8.) In the maiden of twelve years, the daughter of Jairus, who died and was resuscitated, (Luke viii: 41,) he recognized a symbolic representative of his "Inferior Wisdom," (Achamoth,) the mother of Demiurge. In like manner, he saw represented in the woman, who, for twelve years, had suffered from an issue of blood, and was healed by our Lord, (Matt. xix: 20), the sufferings and deliverance of his twelfth primeval spirit, (æon).

Now, what significance has all this for our question? Even at that time, before the middle of the second century, the authority of our Gospels (and John here takes precedence,) was so great, that even so fantastic a philosopher strove to make it appear that these creations of his fancy of heavenly essences and æons were derived from the simple language of the Gospels, and were justified by it.

Of a disciple of Valentin, *Ptolemæus* by name, a learned letter has come down to our day. In this is found, in connection with several citations from Matthew, one also from the first chapter of John, in the words: "That all things are made by the same (the Word,) and without the same, nothing is made, saith the Apostle." Another distinguished follower and contemporary of Valentin, Heracleon by name, wrote an entire commentary, still existing in many fragments, on the Gospel of John, and aimed in this, with a wearisome ingenuity, to ground the doctrines of Valentin upon John. What an authority then must the fourth Gospel have already, about the middle of the second century, possessed, when a distinguished follower of so absurd and fantastic a heresy felt himself compelled to write an entire commentary upon it, and that, too, in the interest of this heresy.

As Valentin and his school, notwithstanding all the anti-Christian willfulness, very earnestly desired to have the authority of the Gospels with, and not against themselves, the same was true at this period, and even earlier, of other kindred sects. We men-

tion two of the eldest, those who, after the serpent-spirit, active at the Fall, were called the *Nausenes* (or Ophites,) and those who, from the heavenly land *beyond* the grave, were called the *Peratics*. Both had citations especially from John in their dogmas, as Hippolytus shows in detail. Already in the time of Hadrian, A. D. 117–138, *Basilides* composed a great work, with explanations of our Gospels, probably in order, in the same artful way with Valentin, to justify from them his fanciful views of Divine things. Still we are able to draw this conclusion only from a small number of extant notices of it. We are more safe, however, in affirming that he also availed himself of the Gospel of John; for Hippolytus expressly informs us how he understood the passages, (John i: 9), "That was the true light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world;" and (John ii: 4), "Mine hour is not yet come."

We must refer to still another opposer of the Christian doctrine, in the first half of the second century, because he has often been referred to, to sustain views directly the reverse of our own. We mean that *Marcion*, against whom Tertullian composed the work already mentioned. He was born at Sinope, on the Black Sea, but put forth his peculiar doctrines chiefly in Rome. His special effort was to rupture the connection between Christianity and Judaism. For this reason, he sought to sift from the apostolic writings every thing which seemed to favor Judaism. As now, it has come down to us from antiquity, that Marcion, in the interest of his peculiar views, made a collection of the sacred writings, which falls between the years 140 and 150; that he placed in this collection only the Gospel of Luke, together with ten Pauline Epistles, and that, too, after he had mutilated and deformed the text of all these writings to bring them into harmony with his sentiments, some learned men have imagined that this was the very first collection of the sacred writings of the Church; that his Gospel served as the pattern of that which we call the Gospel of Luke, and not the reverse, but that he knew nothing whatever of John. All three affirmations we hold to be entirely groundless, and as touching the second, this is universally acknowledged. The supposition of Marcion's ignorance of John's Gospel, upon which special stress is laid, is proved to be groundless by the circumstance that Tertullian gives us information of an earlier epistle of Marcion, from which

it appears that at first he had all four Gospels in use, and only at a later day, in the interest of his imaginary improvement of the Church doctrine, limited himself to the mutilated Luke. We have not the smallest right to draw the credibility of this declaration into doubt; the less so, because the entire process of argumentation employed by Tertullian against Marcion rests upon it, as upon an established fact.

Thus, then, the heretics of the ancient Church have rendered us excellent service, as witnesses to the truth in regard to the high antiquity of our Gospels. We must leave them now, to take a step beyond the limits of the Church itself, where we meet the open opposers of Christianity, to whom the entire preaching of the Cross was foolishness and an offense. About the middle of the second century there lived such a man, *Celsus* by name, who left a book full of contempt and scoffing against Christianity. The book itself has long since perished, as it deserved. In spite of all its heat and bitterness, it did no harm at the time to the still youthful and much persecuted Christendom; a fact which the reader will permit to speak comfort to his heart, when he sees or hears the tumult made in our own time by the enemies of Christianity. But, nevertheless, we are compelled to place a high value upon the fact that Origen has preserved for us many extracts from the book of Celsus. From these extracts we learn that Celsus, in his assault upon Christianity, made chief use of our Gospels; as the "writings of the disciples of Jesus," they furnished him with a solid foundation of knowledge, touching what was believed by Christians. Thus he attacks the narrative of the wise men from the East, the flight of the child to Egypt at the bidding of the angel, the appearance of the Dove at the baptism of Jesus, the birth from a virgin, the agony in Gethsemane, the thirst on the cross, and other points. Having taken these and other particulars from the three first Gospels, he assails, also, several things taken from the Gospel of John; for example, that a miracle was demanded of Jesus by the Jews in the temple; that Jesus was characterized as the Word of God; that at the crucifixion blood flowed from his side. From the reports of the resurrection, he mentions that, according to some, two angels came to the grave; according to others, one; in regard to which even Origen observed that the former refers to Luke and John, the latter to Matthew and Mark.

Thus, then, it appears that this heathen opposer of Christianity, in the middle of the second century, entertained no doubt that the four Gospels were to be regarded, as they were looked upon by the Church, as genuine apostolic writings.

The same service as that rendered by this enemy of Christians and by the heretical teachers of the second century is also rendered to us by another literature, closely approximating the latter, which bears the name of the *New Testament Apocrypha*. Some of my readers will ask at once, What is the meaning of this word Apocrypha? Now I am the better able to give information on this point, that, for a long time, I have been every-where searching for these writings, and have been instrumental in bringing many from the dust of the libraries to the knowledge of the world. Moreover, sixteen years ago, I wrote an essay, which secured a prize in Holland, on the origin and value of the Apocryphal Gospels. The New Testament apocryphal books are writings which aimed to secure an adoption into our New Testament, or, at least, to obtain a coördinate place with it, but which were repudiated by the Church. They bear on their face the names of apostles, or of other men highly esteemed in the Church, but falsely. These names were wrongfully employed by unknown writers, in order to obtain currency for their productions. But for what purpose were the apocryphal books composed? In part, to extend, at the discretion of the writer, the truths derived from the Sacred Scripture; in part, arbitrarily to supplement the narratives concerning the Savior, Mary and Joseph, and the Apostles, and, in part, to give authority to heresies by bringing them into coördinate rank with the Scriptures, and into opposition to them. Plainly, these are all base purposes, and the Church was perfectly right in discrediting and rejecting them. Nevertheless they contain much, in a high degree interesting to us, at the present day, in various directions; and in early antiquity, when men did not always know how to distinguish counterfeits and crafty inventions from that which was genuine and true, they were esteemed and used by many persons. For what purpose we ourselves are now to use them, the reader has already been apprised. They are to augment and strengthen our proofs of the early acceptance of our Gospels. In this undertaking we are, of course, dependent upon the determination of the antiquity of the apocryphal writings themselves, and we, therefore,

limit ourselves to the two oldest of those which we have in our possession; the so-called *Gospel of James* and *The Acts of Pilate*. Of both of these we believe ourselves authorized to affirm that they were composed in the first ten years of the second century. Does the reader demand the proof of this affirmation? We present first that which respects the Gospel of James.

In his work of the year 138, as well as in his Dialogue, written somewhat later, Justin makes several statements touching the birth of Jesus, the origin of which can be traced only to the Gospel of James. Justin relates that the birth of Jesus took place in a grotto at Bethlehem. Such a statement is found only in the Gospel of James. In the annunciation to Mary, Justin concludes with the words: "And thou shalt call his name Jesus," adding directly to them, "for he shall save the people from their sins." So precisely does it stand in the Gospel of James. In Matthew, on the other hand, the words are spoken to Joseph, and in Luke the last clause is wanting altogether. But does the dependence of Justin upon the book of James admit of no objection? Of course men can object. It has been conjectured that Justin might have quoted from some work which is lost. How does the objection please the reader? Me it does not please at all, especially when I reflect upon the unfortunate attempt to discover some trace of the lost work. As the authority for Justin's statement has before us the Gospel of James, what justifies us in refusing to recognize it? Not only does Origen, after the expiration of the second century, make mention of the Book of James; not only is his constant subsequent use of it beyond a doubt, we have now, in addition, more than fifty manuscripts of the Greek text, written from the ninth century onward—nay, even a Syriac manuscript of the sixth century. It is only the desire to evade the conclusion that even Justin employed it, which prompts men to lose themselves in the realm of idle conjectures.

But now the work named after James stands in such a relation to our Gospels that they must have been in long and general use before the fictitious writing was produced. Matthew and Luke had asserted that Mary was a virgin mother; still there were sects, diverging from the Church doctrine, who fancied Jesus to be the son of Joseph and Mary. That the brethren of Jesus are mentioned in the Gospels seemed, at least, to prove a later

marriage of Joseph and Mary. Learned Jews threw suspicion upon the correctness of the translation of the prophetic passage touching the Virgin in Matt. i: 23; nay, both Jews and heathen poured contempt and calumny upon the Son of the Virgin. This took place in the first half of the second century, and the Gospel of James was composed to meet it. In this it was shown, in a historical form, that, from her birth onward, Mary had always maintained the highest character; that the virgin-birth was a matter of demonstration, and that she sustained a relation to Joseph far above that of marriage. If this work really falls into the first decade of years in the second century, the composition of the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, to which, as a pretended supplement, it refers, must certainly fall into the last ten years of the first century.

The case is similar with the *Acts of Pilate*, save that this work refers as distinctly to John as to the first Gospels. For this production, also, Justin is our oldest guaranty. It professes to have been written under Pilate, and by the allegation of wonderful occurrences before, during, and after the crucifixion, to deliver a strong testimony for the divinity of Christ. That it must have originated with a Christian hand, engaged in a work of pious fraud, was indeed not discovered by Justin, nor was it detected by Tertullian and others. On the contrary, in his work of A. D. 138, Justin appeals to it twice. First, he mentions the prophesies touching the events heralding the crucifixion (Isai. lxv: 2, and lviii: 2; Ps. xxi: 16, 18), and says: "That they really occurred, you may learn from the Acts composed under Pontius Pilate." Then, again, he appeals to the miraculous cures of Jesus, predicted by Isaiah (xxxv: 4, 6), and adds: "That Jesus really did these things, you may learn from the Acts composed under Pontius Pilate." The testimony of Tertullian is rendered in still more ample terms (Apologetic. 21); for he says that Jesus, from envy, was delivered by the Jewish scribes to Pilate, and by him, yielding to the pressure of the accusers, delivered to crucifixion; that, hanging upon the cross, with a loud cry, he yielded up the ghost; that, at the same moment, the full day was interrupted by the obscuration of the sun; that, as Jesus had predicted his resurrection, a watch of soldiers was set at the grave to prevent the abstraction of the corpse by the disciples; but that upon the third day the earth suddenly quaked,

and the stone which had been rolled before the grave was removed; that nothing but grave-clothes was found in the grave; that a report was spread abroad by the authorities that the disciples had taken the body; but that Jesus himself spent forty days with his disciples, in Galilee, instructing them, and that after he had charged them with the duty of preaching, he was transported to heaven in a cloud. This full report Tertullian concludes with the words: "All this did Pilate himself, forced by conscience to become a Christian, report of Christ to the reigning Emperor, Tiberius."

Such are the testimonies of Justin and Tertullian touching the Acts of Pilate. A work answering to these quotations, and bearing also the same title as in Justin, we possess at present. in many ancient Greek, Latin, and other original manuscript documents. Is it the same which was read by Justin and Tertullian? The affirmative answer has been resisted in many ways. It has been imagined that both men indulged a false opinion of the existence of such a work, and that it was therefore found only at a later date. This is an utterly groundless fancy. Others will have it that the old work itself is lost, and that the extant one is only an imitation of it. Has this opinion any solid foundation? By no means; none at all. True, indeed, the oldest text, when subsequently transcribed, was in many passages altered, as touching the expression; nay, more, in the middle ages, the Latins exchanged the title, The Acts of Pilate for the title "The Gospel of Nicodemus," and added a preface. We have, also, in connection with the elder Greek text, a more modern revision, but, upon the whole, we have decisive grounds for believing that our Acts of Pilate, with its elder text, in the main, really contains the work used by Justin and Tertullian. By our own researches in the European libraries, important proofs of this position have been discovered; namely, a manuscript written in the Egyptian language, on paper of the oldest kind, (papyrus,) of the fifth century; and, also, a parchment manuscript, with the Latin text, of the same century, which, although washed out about a thousand years ago, and replaced by a new inscription upon the parchment, thus cleansed, (such manuscripts are denominated palimpsests,) remaining, for good eyes, still legible. These two ancient documents, with an Egyptian and a Latin translation, insure the high antiquity of our Greek text, from

which they were derived; for, if even in the fifth century there existed such translations, the work itself, as highly esteemed, must have existed long before. But we must present the matter with still greater exactness. The primitive work was very precious to Christians. The example both of Justin and Tertullian proves it. Justin makes his appeal to the Roman Cæsar, upon this basis, as if it were a work of decisive weight. This high estimation of it naturally continued. Eusebius and Epiphanius prove this, as touching the fourth century. We learn from the former that, at the beginning of the fourth century, the Emperor Maximin, who was bitterly hostile to Christianity, caused spurious Acts of Pilate, full of scoffing and calumny, to be published, and even to be distributed in the schools, plainly in order to suppress and counteract the work held in such esteem by the Christians. In this state of facts, is it in the smallest degree credible, that precisely at this period, from the fourth or fifth century forward, the old work, so remarkably serviceable, should have been entirely revised; and that precisely at this period, the ancient and famous work itself having entirely disappeared, the revision should have been every-where distributed—should have been translated and preserved to our day? The supposition is in flat contradiction to a sound judgment. It contradicts the work itself as we have it, inasmuch as it unites a very peculiar freedom of narrative with a dependence upon the Gospels. It can therefore perplex those people only who are entirely unacquainted with the subject. Not desiring to be reckoned in this number, we draw, with perfect confidence, the conclusions which follow from our conscientious examination. Our "Acts of Pilate" not only presupposes the narratives of the first three Gospels, but also absolutely and very especially the Gospel of John. For while its report of the crucifixion and resurrection connects itself with the first, that of the trial, in its entire complexion, depends upon the narrative of John. What is the inference as touching our question? If the so-called Acts of Pilate, for the reason that Justin, as early as the year 138, so earnestly emphasizes its value, must be admitted to have been written at the beginning of the second century, then the Gospel of John and the rest, since they are so completely presupposed, must be admitted to have been written in the *first* century.

This inference is so grand and so decisive, that we are not in-

clined to draw upon the New Testament Apocrypha for other materials which might perhaps be employed in our argument.

The testimony of the Acts of Pilate and of the Gospel of James falls, then, at the beginning of the second century. By a retrogressive movement, we have been conducted, step by step, from the end of this century to its beginning. But we are carried back to the same time, also, by another work of high fame in Christian literature—a work which, from the end of the second century to the beginning of the fourth, was reckoned to belong to Holy Scripture, and that, too, by men of the highest authority. That this work is able to render a testimony of the highest significance, in relation to our question in regard to the antiquity of the Gospels—for this result, as already intimated, we have to thank the fortunate discovery of the Sinai Bible. We refer to the *Epistle of Barnabas.*

This letter, in object and character, is similar to the Epistle to the Hebrews. It is directed to those Christians who, having been converted from Judaism, desired to retain under the New Covenant some of the leading peculiarities of the Old; as, for example, some of the false teachers among the Galatians, opposed by Paul, had maintained that it was necessary to do. In opposition to this product of a Judaizing Christianity, the epistle cites the proof that the New Covenant, founded by Christ, had entirely canceled the old one, and that, in general, this was only an imperfect picture of the new.

For two centuries past, the Christian Church has occupied itself much with this epistle, but, unfortunately, in all the manuscripts of the Greek text to be found in European libraries, the first five chapters are wanting. An ancient but very imperfect Latin translation alone supplied the defect. In this Latin translation, a passage in the fourth chapter has for a long time drawn to itself very especial attention. It is this: "Let us therefore beware that we be not found as it is written, 'many called but few chosen.'" The expression, "as it is written," the reader will have become sufficiently familiar with from the New Testament. I must beg him to read again Matt. iv: 1–11, where the temptation of our Lord is narrated. The weapon which the Savior uses against the tempter consists in the words, "It is written;" and the tempter also employs the same weapon against the Savior, for he also cries out, "For it is written." It is the

formula by which sentiments from the Holy Scripture, as the established Word of God, are distinguished from all others in the world. The Apostles, like the Savior, often employ it when they quote sentiments from the Old Testament. To the writings composed by Apostles, plainly this formula could not be applied until these writings had attained a footing of equal authority with those of the Old Covenant. If we find, therefore, in the ancient writings of the Church passages quoted from the Gospels, with the same formula, then, at the time when these writings were composed, the Gospels must have had a coördinate authority with the Old Testament. As soon as this equal authority was attained, there existed a New Testament, side by side with the Old. The words, however, which, in the Epistle of Barnabas, are quoted with this formula, are found, it is well known, in the Gospel of Matt. xxii: 14; also, xx: 16. If this is correct, it follows that at the time of the composition of the Epistle of Barnabas, the Gospel of Matthew was regarded as Holy Scripture.

As the Epistle of Barnabas belongs to the highest Christian antiquity, this fact has appeared to many scholars entirely incredible. And the doubt whether the writer of the epistle really annexed to the passage from Matthew the great formula, "as it is written," has been supported by the circumstance that the first five chapters were to be found only in the Latin translation. It was possible, therefore, to say this great formula was inserted at a much later day by the translator. A learned theologian (Dr. Credner), writing in the year 1832, used upon this point the following language: "The passage in question is no longer extant in the original Greek text. The formula to which he had become accustomed was easily added to the words by the translator, and on internal grounds we must lay claim to the adjustment of the text in our passage, until the contrary is proved." In order, therefore, to decide upon the origin of the formula, the Greek text was required. And it was the order of Providence that this original text should be presented to the Christian world, soon after these words were written. Whilst in learned Germany the question was undergoing discussion, whether in this important particular the Latin text was trustworthy, the decisive original text was lying concealed in the solitary Arabian desert, among the old parchment books of a Greek convent.

However many of these had perished in the course of centuries by the tooth of time, and been destroyed by the hands of ignorant monks, an invisible Eye was watching over this treasure; at the very moment when it was on the point of perishing by fire, the Lord interposed for its rescue. In the Sinai Bible, then, the entire Epistle of Barnabas, in the original Greek text, now reappears. And what is the decision of this original text touching the passage in question? Its decision is, that the great Christian classic formula, "as it is written," was prefixed to the passage from Matthew by the author of the epistle, and not by the translator.

After this unexpected fact had been established in so surprising a manner, a new question was raised, whether the important inference from it must be unconditionally admitted. May not the formula, "as it is written," by possibility refer to any written book whatever? How little possible this is, our previous explanations touching the use of this formula will have satisfied the reader. We have not the least right to explain away its significance in the present case. But occasion has here been found for a very extraordinary device. In an apochryphal book, probably composed by a Jewish Christian, after the destruction of Jerusalem, called the fourth book of Esra, we have these words: For many have been born, but few will be saved. This declaration has a certain similarity to that of the Savior in Matthew, but is certainly distinct from it. Nevertheless, a certain scholar has had the ingenuity, in all gravity, to affirm that the words of the Savior in Matthew, cited in connection with this formula, "as it is written," in the Epistle of Barnabas, were not taken from Matthew, but from Esra, only the author of the epistle exchanged the one passage for the other. Accordingly, the formula, "as it is written," refers to the apocryphal book of Esra, and not to Matthew. It is characteristic enough of Strauss, the theologian, who has converted the whole life of Jesus into a fantastic vision, that he should accord his approbation to this piece of intellectual legerdemain, touching the passage in the Epistle of Barnabas. For ourselves, we can find in it nothing but an expression of that anti-Christian wit belonging to the atmosphere of such men as Renan. In cases like this, the prediction of Paul, in the Second Epistle to Timothy, (iv: 4,) finds a fulfillment: "And they shall turn away their ears from the truth,

and shall be turned unto fables." Now I presume the reader will agree with me, that so long as nothing better can be produced to weaken the passage in the Epistle of Barnabas, no one will permit himself to be led astray in this case who is sincerely asking for the truth. The device which has here been presented only serves to show what desperate efforts are put forth in order to escape from the inferences derived from the passage.

These inferences, however, we have now more distinctly to vindicate. The Epistle of Barnabas can not be placed later than at the beginning of the second century. Opinion formerly wavered between the first and second decades of years in this century, but the Sinai Bible, which, for the first time, has thrown a true light upon the entire epistle, has produced an inclination (as in the case of Dr. Weizsäcker,) to go back to the last decade of years in the first century. In this venerable work, which, at the close of the second century, Clement of Alexandria reckoned as a part of Holy Scripture, there are found (a fact not yet mentioned by us,) several obvious references to the Gospel of Matthew, *e. g.*, ix: 13, (in the fifth chapter, "that he might show that he came not to call the righteous, but sinners, to repentance;" the words "to repentance," both in the Epistle of Barnabas and in Matthew, were interpolated as an explanation, borrowed from Luke v: 32,) in all probability also to the passage in John iii: 14, where, in the twelfth chapter, the serpent hanging upon a cross is made a symbol of the crucified Savior. But we direct special attention to the fact, that in it (for this is a matter which here particularly concerns us,) Matt. xxii: 14, is quoted with the formula accustomed to be employed only for citations from Holy Writ. Hence, it follows that at the beginning of the second century the Gospel of Matthew possessed already the authority of Sacred Scripture.

This result, this fact becomes all the more significant, if we are justified in affirming that the Gospel of Matthew could not be taken into the canon, that is, into the number of the Sacred Books, by itself alone, but only in connection with the other three Gospels. How do we prove this position? In our previous investigations, carried over the three first quarters of the second century, the figure prominent in the foreground has been sometimes Matthew, sometimes John, and sometimes Luke, whereas

Mark, on the other hand, from his essential characteristics, as compared with those of the others, was less suited to citation. How can this be interpreted to mean that the particular Gospel which on any occasion was employed, enjoyed, in distinction from the others, the highest authority in the Church? Thus it appeared, from the reference to the Acts of Pilate in Justin, that the Gospel of John presupposed in this book must have been written about the close of the first century; for Justin himself, in the first half of the second century, had quoted John, and still more frequently Matthew. Is not this alone a sufficient proof that if, at the period of the Epistle of Barnabas, Matthew possessed canonical authority, John also possessed a like authority? Basilides, in the time of Hadrian (A. D. 117–138), referred to John and Luke; Valentin, about A. D. 140, to John, Matthew, and Luke. Do they not yield fresh proofs of like tenor? Moreover, at a very early period, for example in the time of Justin, the Gospels were gathered into one whole, under the name of the Gospel, so that the names of the individual authors receded, in the presence of the common character of their writings; and in the second half of the second century we have found in Irenæus the quadruplicity of the Gospels established as a fact, long since perfectly settled. In the whole course of the century we hear nothing of discussions or decisions upon the subject. What is the inference from all these facts? It is that no one of our four Gospels is entitled, in preference to the others, to the authority of Holy Scripture? On the contrary, the Church placed her Gospels, as she possessed them, in a fourfold form, and as esteemed by her in this fourfold form to be genuine apostolic writings, side by side with the Old Testament.

If, now, we inquire further, when this took place, every consideration forces us to the latter part of the first century. This was the time when, at the death of the aged John, all the holy men who in person had been with Christ, as well as Paul the great Apostle to the Gentiles, had departed from life, and no longer formed a central point for the infant Church. This was the period when the Church, widely spread abroad in the world, saw her faith assailed from without, as a folly, and from within by heretical teachers. At that time she consecrated and hallowed the writings left by the Apostles, as precious, imperishable legacies, as incontrovertible testimonies of the life of the Redeemer,

as containing the highest norms of faith and of life. The proper time also had arrived for placing these writings on an equal footing with those of the Old Covenant. For at this time the perfect separation of the Church from the synagogue had taken place. After the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple, in the year 70, the Church was thrown more and more upon its own resources, and became more and more independent. It was a significant act of this independence, the act of annexing to the ancient Holy Scriptures of the synagogue, upon which Christianity itself so fundamentally rested, the perfectly attested records of the Savior's life, and other primeval apostolic written documents, as having sprung from the same source, and entitled to equal consideration.

Does the reader inquire in what way and by what act this took place? Of a surety, no learned assembly held a sitting in the case. If such men as Matthew, as Mark and Luke, as John, had left memoirs of the life of our Lord, was any thing more than their venerable names required to insure to their writings the highest authority in the Church?—and had not all these men stood in a personal relation to the Church sufficiently intimate to secure it from any possible works of imposture, decorated with their names? Of no Gospel more than that of John does this consideration hold true. If his Gospel emanated from his congregation in Asia Minor, and took possession of a wider field, could the slightest suspicion of spuriousness have attached to it? In case, however, that it did not originate in his own congregation, must not that congregation have at once, and without hesitation, recognized the fraud? It would have been impossible to introduce among them, from a foreign quarter, a pretended work of their own bishops, and especially such a work.

We possess a piece of information of ancient date, which must here be noticed. Eusebius records it in his Church History, (iii, 24). It is, that the three first Gospels, already widely circulated, were laid before John by his friends. He bore testimony to their truth, but noticed in them the omission of what Jesus had done at the commencement of his public ministry. For this reason his friends expressed the wish that he would supplement the omitted period. This information is confirmed by the contents of John's Gospel, as Eusebius himself has remarked.

We recognize, then, the close of the first century, the time in

which the death of John took place at Ephesus, as the period when the Church began to regard her four Gospels, (not to mention here her other written monuments of similar date,) as Holy Scripture. Even the considerations which we have just presented, in order to determine the point of time at which this took place, justify this assumption; but we should not be able to state it with perfect confidence, did not the history and literature of the entire second century, which we have traced as far as possible, urgently constrain us to this supposition, nay, to this conviction.

We have only one thing more to add to our survey of the earliest Christian literature. We refer to the testimony of *Papias*, which, beyond all others of late years, has been perverted by the enemies of our Gospels. The obscurity which rests upon the man himself, as well as upon his testimony, disqualifies him to become an independent witness, or even to be placed in antagonism to other witnesses; yet this has happened.

Through Eusebius (iii, 39), we know that he wrote a work in five books, which he styled, "An Exposition of the Sayings of the Lord." In collecting materials for this work, he entertained the idea that his purpose would be better served by the living word of tradition than by what he might find in "books." His sources of information, therefore, according to his assurance, were such oral reports as were capable of being traced to the Apostles. His own language in regard to these sources is as follows: "I shall collect what I have learned from the Elders (Presbyters) and have retained in memory, at the same time confirming their truth by my own explanations." Again: "Also when I fell in with any one who had had intercourse with the Elders, I made inquiry concerning the communications of the Elders, what Andrew or Peter had said, or what Philip, or what Thomas or James, or what John or Matthew, or what any other of the disciples of the Lord." Who the Elders referred to in these words were is not entirely clear. Those men of letters who would make the term refer to the Apostles themselves are certainly in the wrong. We are rather to understand by it venerable men, who had had personal intercourse with the Apostles. So Eusebius, whose judgment rested upon a knowledge of the entire work of Papias, understood the word, and expressed himself upon the point in still more definite terms. He testifies expressly that

Papias by no means claims to be a man who had himself heard and seen the holy Apostles, but a pupil of Aristion, and of the Presbyter, or Elder, John, to whose testimony also he most frequently appealed. Even Eusebius regarded it as an error in Irenæus, that he had characterized him as a "hearer of John and a companion of Polycarp," a passage in which Irenæus must have confounded Presbyter John, mentioned by Papias as his teacher, with the Apostle of the same name. This is confirmed by the circumstance that Irenæus derives an extravagant tradition touching the millenial kingdom expressly, "from the mouth of the Elders, who had seen John, the disciple of the Lord." In this passage, beyond doubt, Irenæus distinguishes the Elders from the Apostles; but since he appeals to Papias for the tradition concerning the millenial kingdom, he leaves no room to doubt that the Elders of whom he speaks were no other than those mentioned by Papias.

Now Eusebius extracts from the contents of this work of Papias several paragraphs; namely, one stating that the daughters of the Apostle Philip, at Hierapolis, reported to him the resuscitation of a dead person effected in the lifetime of their father; and one stating that Justus Barsabbas partook of a cup of poison without suffering any harm from it. Furthermore, and we here cite literally the language of Eusebius, Papias declared that he learned much more in the form of oral tradition, "also some unheard-of (strange)* parables and teachings of the Lord, and some other matter partaking too much of the fabulous." Of this character, Eusebius pronounces the doctrine of a millenial kingdom, which, after the resurrection of the dead, in a sensuous way, should exist upon this earth. The description of this kingdom is given not by Eusebius, but by Irenæus. The language stands thus: "There shall come days in which vines shall grow, each one of which shall bear ten thousand branches, each branch ten thousand twigs, each twig ten thousand sprouts, each sprout ten thousand grapes, and each grape shall yield twenty-five measures of wine; and when one of the saints shall pluck a grape, another shall cry out: I am a better grape, take me; through me praise the Lord! In like manner shall a kernel of

* The Greek word has both senses. Eusebius appears to have expressed by it his own judgment, touching the pretended discourses of our Lord.

3. *The Vicarious Sacrifice, grounded in principles of Universal Obligation.* By HORACE BUSHNELL. New York: Charles Scribner & Co.: 1866. 8vo. pp. 552. For sale in Cincinnati, by George S. Blanchard & Co.

With his wonted vigor the author endeavors to sustain the so-called moral view of the Atonement, to the utter exclusion of any and every form of substitution. By vicarious sacrifice he means simply the assumption by Christ of those earthly sufferings which a good being, in the exercise of love, must either take upon himself or endure in this world of sin; or, as the author rhetorically expresses it, Christ "is to go down into the hell of the world's corporate evil, to be wounded and galled by the world's malice, and bear the burden of the world's undoing as a charge upon his love," and so, by these agonies of sacrifice, to bring men to God. However ingeniously the Broad Church theory of the Atonement, in any of its forms may be put, it fails to meet the demands of sound Biblical exegesis, or the full wants of an accusing conscience. If this work, notwithstanding its grave errors, shall be the means of leading to a more thorough investigation of the teachings of the Scriptures, in respect to the work of the Redeemer and the divine plan of justification, it will not have been written in vain.

4. *Hours among the Gospels, or Wayside Truths from the Life of our Lord.* By N. C. Burt, D. D. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippencott & Co.: 1865. 12mo. pp. 215.

The accomplished pastor of the Broadway Church in Cincinnati, has here given a series of interesting observations, suggested by his study of the New Testament, on passages which appeared susceptible of striking illustration from unexpected sources. The field on which he has entered is capable of almost endless exploration, and the tasteful, cautious and suggestive manner of treatment exhibited in these essays is every way worthy of imitation.

5. *Life and Character of J. H. Van der Palm, D. D.*, Professor of Oriental Languages and Antiquities, also of Sacred Poetry and Eloquence, in the University of Leyden. Translated from the Dutch, by J. P. Westervelt. N. York: Hurd & Houghton: 1865. 12mo. pp. 401.

This work consists of a translation, first, of an interesting biography of one of the most eminent theologians and preachers of the last generation in Holland, by the genial Dr. Beets, of Utrecht; and, next, of a selection of his best sermons. Van der Palm occupied a high position in his own country as a pulpit orator, as well as an expounder and translator of the Bible, and these discourses confirm the opinion generally held that his sermons, however free from the appearance of art, were very carefully prepared.

A CONCISE

DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE:

COMPRISING ITS

ANTIQUITIES,
BIOGRAPHY,
GEOGRAPHY, and
NATURAL HISTORY.

EDITED BY WILLIAM SMITH, LL. D.

Thick Octavo, Cloth, with 270 Plans and Wood-Cuts, $6.00. Half Calf, $8.00.

This condensation of the "DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE" has been made by Mr. William Aldis Wright, M. A., Librarian of Trinity College, Cambridge, under the direction and superintendence of Dr. William Smith. It is intended to satisfy a generally expressed wish for an account of the most recent Biblical studies in a form adapted for universal circulation.

A Dictionary of the Bible, in some form or another, is indispensable for every family. The Divine, the Scholar, and all who desire to investigate thoroughly the various subjects connected with the Bible, and to master those controversies which are now exciting such deep and general interest, must still have recourse to the Larger Dictionary; but to Students, to Private Families, and to that numerous class of persons who desire to arrive at results simply, this

CONCISE DICTIONARY

Will, it is believed, supply all that is necessary for the elucidation and explanation of the Bible. It is the main object of the Editor to place within the reach of every Christian household a popular abstract of a work which has received the approval of those competent to express an opinion on the subject.

☞ To any Parish or Sabbath School ordering ten copies, we will supply one copy gratis; to an order for twenty-five copies, three copies gratis, or one set of the Larger Work, in three volumes.

A copy of this Work will be sent, post-paid, to any address, on receipt of the advertised price, by the publishers.

LITTLE, BROWN & CO.,
110 Washington Street, Boston, Mass.